

CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM
WATER QUALITY GOAL IMPLEMENTATION TEAM
SEPTEMBER 8, 2014 CONFERENCE CALL MINUTES

ACTION ITEMS AND DECISIONS

ACTION: RSVP to egiese@chesapeakebay.net and power.lucinda@epa.gov and make hotel reservations with Liberty Mountain by September 12th for the October face-to-face meeting.

ACTION: Contact Emma Giese if you plan to attend the October 7-8 face-to-face meeting and have not yet received logistical information.

DECISION: WQGIT membership approved the revised Urban Stream Restoration Panel Report as written.

ACTION: Submit nominations for Toxic Contaminants Workgroup members and for planning group members to Greg Allen (allen.greg@epa.gov) by September 12th.

ACTION: Next WQGIT conference call tentatively scheduled for October 20th from 1:30-3:30pm.

WORKGROUP UPDATES

Land Use Workgroup

- The Land Use Workgroup met on August 12 to discuss the details of the Phase 6.0 land use classification, and met with the Modeling Workgroup on September 4.
- LUWG will present the proposed comprehensive list of land uses to the Modeling Workgroup in late September and to the WQGIT on October 7-8.
- The next conference call is scheduled for September 25.

Agriculture Workgroup

- The Agriculture Workgroup finalized their verification guidance and approved the Resource Improvement Technical Review Panel's final report on August 8.
- The AgWG met on August 14 and began discussing a statistically based approach to determine sample size for BMP verification.
- The AgWG is in the process of finalizing the Phase 6.0 agricultural land uses.
- At their next meeting on September 11, the AgWG will be re-prioritizing the queue of agricultural BMPs to be reviewed by expert panels.

BMP Verification Committee

- The Committee held a conference call on July 31. They worked through the series of comments submitted on the May 2014 draft of the BMP Verification Framework Document and agreed to changes to the document. The revised document and framework was distributed to the Management Board on August 15.

Urban Stormwater Workgroup

- The USWG discussed the new Virginia Tech panel process and updates to the NDGI (Nutrient Discharges from Gray Infrastructure) expert panel report on July 15.
- The USWG did not meet in August. Their next meeting/call is scheduled for September 23.

Watershed Technical Workgroup

- The WTWG held a call on August 28, where they discussed the NEIEN appendix and codes list.
- The WTWG approved the revisions to Urban Stream Restoration Panel report on August 28.
- WTWG recommended further analysis prior to approving the Shoreline Management Report. (Matt Johnston will provide more information).

- Their next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, October 2.

Wastewater Treatment Workgroup

- The WWTWG held its call on June 24, which included a briefing on the expert panel recommendations for nutrient discharges from grey infrastructure.
- The WWTWG will reconvene on September 9 to discuss two technologies being proposed for credit under the protocols for advanced on-site wastewater treatment systems.

Trading and Offsets Workgroup

- The next TOWG is scheduled for September 17.
- TOWG will discuss a technical memorandum on certification and verification.

Forestry Workgroup:

- The FWG had a conference call on August 6. During this call, Craig Highfield (Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay) updated the group on his Forests for the Bay projects.
- The next conference call will be on October 1.
- The Chesapeake Bay Urban Tree Canopy Summit will take place October 14 and 15 in Linthicum, MD. The second day of this Summit will be devoted to an interactive work session towards generating the management strategy for the urban tree canopy outcome.
- The Field Foresters Smith Island trip sponsored by the FWG will take place October 28 – 29.
- The next FWG face-to-face meeting will be December 3– 4. The meeting’s focus will be on the Workgroup’s management strategies for the two forestry outcomes in the Chesapeake Bay Agreement.

MINUTES

Welcome/Confirm Call Participants, Recent Workgroup Decisions and Updates – Jenn Volk, Chair

- Jenn Volk, Chair (University of Delaware), welcomed everyone to the call and reviewed workgroup updates.
 - Matt Johnston (UMD/CBPO) addressed the Shoreline Management Report. The WTWG was concerned that the Shoreline Management BMP applies to a load that not is specifically modeled in the CBP Watershed Model. They asked the CBPO Modeling Team to look at the estuary model and determine how many nutrients are coming off the land from sediment erosion along the shoreline. The WTWG wants to make sure a cap is set so that jurisdictions cannot submit BMPs that exceed that maximum nutrient load.
 - Lucinda Power (EPA/CBPO): EPA Region 3 will be sending out a letter to federal facility contacts, followed by one from EPA’s CBPO, asking for BMP submission data in the fall timeframe. Included in the EPA CBPO will be a template that agencies can use and submit to the jurisdictions for data reporting.
 - Greg Allen (EPA, CBPO): Letters have not gone out yet, but federal agencies received a preview several months ago. The deadline for BMP submission data is Oct 1.

Modeling Workgroup Update – Lee Currey/Dave Montali, Modeling Workgroup Chairs

- Dave Montali (WV DEP): The Modeling Workgroup held a conference call on September 5th. The group heard presentations for modeling projects for marsh erosion and the extension of wet deposition of nitrogen. Both projects are moving forward. They also received a summary from Peter Claggett (USGS) relative to the status of the Land Use Workgroup’s work on Phase 6 land use classifications. They were advised of the need for the Modeling Workgroup to weigh in on the practicality of having a stream corridor land use. They will address the issue of stream corridor land use at the next quarterly

meeting, as well as communicate workgroup priorities at the October Face-to-Face WQGIT meeting. Next quarterly is set for September 30th- October 1st.

- Lee Currey (MDE): Modeling Workgroup is committed to finalizing Phase 6 by December 2015. Preparation for the face-to-face meeting includes plans to address climate change, Conowingo, and the James River.

WQGIT October 2014 Meeting – James Davis-Martin, Vice-Chair

- James Davis-Martin (VA DEQ): Updated members on the upcoming face-to-face meeting and discussed the [agenda](#) that was developed by the planning committee. If you do not see a topic you feel should be covered, it is likely listed as a subtopic.
 - Scott Phillips (USGS): Would the face-to-face be a good time to talk about management strategies we would need to write as a goal team in order to reach attainment and monitoring goals?
 - James: There will be an opportunity for that on the first morning at 10:30 am.
 - Dianne McNally (EPA): Has the goal team considered any implementation issues?
 - James: Yes, we tried to work through it but there will be a need for a number of future meetings. At the bottom of the draft agenda, there is a list of agenda items we feel will require future meetings.
 - McNally: Is there room for a topic on lessons learned? For example, things that are working in some states that could be helpful in other states?
 - Davis-Martin: Yes, that is a good suggestion for future agendas and may be ongoing at the workgroup level. The milestones workgroup could potentially have that discussion.

ACTION: RSVP to egiese@chesapeakebay.net and power.lucinda@epa.gov and make hotel reservations with Liberty Mountain by September 12th for the October face-to-face meeting.

ACTION: Contact Emma Giese if you plan to attend the October 7-8 face-to-face meeting and have not yet received logistical information.

BMP Expert Panels Phase 5.3.2 Recommendations – Chris Brosch, VA-DCR

- Chris Brosch (VA DCR) discussed an approach being developed to incorporate best professional judgment recommendations from expert panels for phase 5.3.2, allowing the panels to shift their focus to phase 6.0. This approach involves convening face-to-face meetings with the expert panels so they can address questions regarding Tier 2 Nutrient Management reduction efficiencies.
 - For more details on the recommendations see the [proposal](#).
 - Meetings not yet scheduled, looking at first several weeks of October.
- Davis-Martin: It is important to recognize these reports already utilize best professional judgment.
- Currey: Having the best information that provides credit for practices on the ground is very important, especially under the milestones evaluations.
- Brosch: For clarification, we are not relying solely on best professional judgment.
- John Rhoderick (MDA): This is only where we have standing panels already.
 - Brosch: Yes, and when the recommendations come around, they will only be approved amendments to the reports, not new reports.
- Volk thanked them for their work and mentioned the goal of a decision by December 2014.

Urban Stream Restoration Panel Report – Bill Stack, Center for Watershed Protection

- Bill Stack (Center for Watershed Protection) presented changes made during the pilot phase of the Urban Stream Restoration BMP. The Watershed Technical Workgroup has reviewed and approved a new technical appendix for this report.
 - See his [presentation](#) for more details.
 - The full report can be seen [here](#), and the full stream restoration appendices [here](#).
- Marel King (CBC): Is there an effort to relook at nutrient loadings from certain land uses if we are finding reductions from BMPs that exceed those loads?
 - Gary Shenk (EPA, CBPO): Yes. For the next version in Phase 6, we want to explicitly simulate shoreline erosion loads.
- Davis-Martin: Having a cap on reduction credit you can receive for the model is a challenge when planning implementation. I am glad to hear we are trying to improve the nutrient loadings.
 - Shenk: While problems are rare, I agree that improvements are needed.
 - Johnston: The same concern was brought up at the Watershed Technical Workgroup. Bill suggested we tell states and localities to contact us for the loads while they are in their planning phase. It doesn't entirely close the gap, but it brings it closer.
- Davis-Martin: If BMP reductions are land use specific, how will load reductions from these BMPs affect allocations?
 - Shenk: You want credit to go to who actually did the work, but in some cases a stream restoration project reduces agricultural loads from upstream more than anything else. That is a tough question.
 - Currey: I agree that there is an allocation tracking question. My second concern is that we now treat stream restoration BMPs different than other values. I would like to see some type of small stream simulation occur in Phase 6, so you can better track this type of practice.
 - Stack: The Land Use Work Group is trying to do that tracking.
 - Currey: We should continue to move forward with the recommendations but we need to recognize that this practice is different and is being treated differently in the model. Should be looked at in Phase 6.
- Volk: Some people should get together about a Phase 6 wish list and talk about potential direction.
 - Shenk: That is happening already, across a number of workgroups.
- McNally: Is the Modeling Workgroup going to address double crediting of nitrogen and phosphorus associated with sediment and how the different protocols address this issue?
 - Stack: Yes, we are looking at that as we speak.
- Volk asked for objections to the report, none were raised.

DECISION: WQGIT membership approved the revised Urban Stream Restoration Panel Report as written.

Toxics Strategy and Workgroup – Greg Allen, EPA

- Greg Allen (EPA): Participants interested in forming a smaller group to come together to plan a kickoff meeting for the Toxics workgroup in October, please let us know. If anyone would like to provide membership updates or suggestions, please let Greg know by the end of the week. We will need quite a bit of input from EPA because of the regulatory authority EPA has for PCB controls. Orange color on the membership list represents people we think will be interested but we have yet to contact and

confirm. If they do not wish to participate, we will look for someone else from their organization. Jamie Mitchell from Hampton roads has been fundamental. Academics would be a strong addition. Maybe engage STAC.

- Early list of potential workgroup membership can be seen [here](#).

ACTION: Submit nominations for Toxic Contaminants Workgroup members and for planning group members to Greg Allen (allen.greg@epa.gov) by September 12th.

- Montali: How did you choose the representatives from WV?
 - Allen: A call through the Management Board.
- Davis-Martin: Will the group initially focus on PCBs or will there be a broader focus that will require other representatives from other sectors?
 - Allen: There are two outcomes: the first is mostly research oriented and we would like to start off broad so that we can focus on the right issues. The second outcome is more policy oriented and specifically addresses PCBs, so it will be a little more focused.
 - McNally: The second outcome talks about PCBs, but also other contaminants. Is the first goal to tackle PCBs, and then to look later at other contaminants that are to be determined?
 - Allen: Yes, it looks like it will be that sequence. For that second goal, we may wait on other contaminants until PCBs are figured out because that alone will be a long list of challenges. There is a March deadline for these Management Strategies to go out for public comment. My own bias is that we should focus on PCBs in order to have a strong product to put forward by March. When the group comes together, we will need to tease apart these outcomes so we know the initial objectives.
- Allen: EPA has money for funding the development of Management Strategies by the Goal Implementation Teams and the WQGIT is scheduled to receive \$50k in funding for research on combined nutrient and sediment reduction BMPs. In the next few weeks, we will need to finalize that proposal and be more specific about deliverables and due dates. We would like to invite the WQGIT to provide more input and feedback.
 - Volk: When Greg establishes a deadline, we will set up a forum for feedback via email.
- Volk thanked Greg for coordinating and Sam Watterson for staffing this new workgroup.

Attainment and Monitoring Outcome – Scott Phillips, USGS

- Phillips: Decision framework is being used to put together Management Strategies for the attainment and monitoring outcome. We can go back and look at that document to figure out how we need to update it. You can reach out to Scott (swphilli@usgs.gov) if you have any questions.

Phase 6.0 Land Uses – Peter Claggett, USGS

- Claggett: Presented on the proposed Phase 6 land uses. More detail and finalized land use classifications will be presented at the October face-to-face meeting.
 - For more details, please see his [presentation](#).
- Montali: Has the overlap of permitted data been considered?

- Claggett: We've tried to get permit polygon data, but if we can only get point data, we'll try to eliminate any discrepancies between permits and what we see on the ground.
- Montali: What is permitted sometimes changes and is no longer current. We will need further discussions.
 - Claggett: I agree, the same is true with construction.
- Davis-Martin: What is the distinction between shrub/scrub/grass in the natural category and open space in the urban category?
 - Claggett: The difference is urban open space is managed and maintained as open space, whereas the shrub/scrub/grass would likely be natural land in early successional stages that would eventually turn back to forest.
- Ben Sears (NYSDEC): Who was the source of the land use and parcel data?
 - Claggett: Initially collected through state agencies in the Land Use Work Group. TetraTech was then contracted to fill in data gaps.
- Montali: Can you give additional info to the types of data that were provided?
 - Claggett: Yes, I can do that with a handout at the face-to-face meeting.

Land Use Projections – Matt Johnston, UMD

- Matt Johnston provided an update on land use projections for 2014-2015. There will be more detail at the October face-to-face meeting.
 - For more information and the timeline, see his [presentation](#).
- Montali: We know that we are excluding some small construction projects below permitted threshold?
 - Johnston: We asked for states to submit an estimate of non-permitted acres to help with that.
 - McNally- Does the data source just recognize urban protected or federal land? Or all protected?
 - Claggett: All protected and federal land.
- Volk thanked Matt for his presentation.
- Volk: I would like everyone to set aside 1:30-3:30pm on Oct. 20th for a potential follow up WQGIT call after the face-to-face meeting.

ACTION: Next WQGIT conference call tentatively scheduled for October 20th from 1:30-3:30pm.

Adjourned

WQGIT Face-to-Face Meeting

October 7-8, 2014

Liberty Mountain Ski Resort

Carroll Valley, PA

List of Call Participants

Name	Affiliation
Jennifer Volk (Chair)	U Delaware
James Davis-Martin (Vice-Chair)	VADEQ
Lucinda Power (Coordinator)	EPA/CBPO
David Wood (Staff)	CRC
Emma Giese (Staff)	CRC

Marel King	CBC
Mike Land	Corps of Engineers
Jeremy Hanson	CRC
Bill Stack	CWP
George Onyullo	DDOE
Mary Searing	DDOE
Cheryl Quinn	Dept. of the Navy
Bill Angstadt	DMAA
John Schneider	DNREC
Ann Carkhuff	EPA Region 3
Dianne McNally	EPA Region 3
Jennifer Sincock	EPA Region 3
Suzanne Trevena	EPA Region 3
Gary Shenk	EPA/CBPO
Greg Allen	EPA/CBPO
Lewis Linker	EPA/CBPO
Jennifer Tribo	Hampton Roads PDC
Ross Mandel	ICPRB
Bruce Michael	MD DNR
Helen Stewart	MD DNR
Jason Kepler	MDA
John Rodderick	MDA
Dinorah Dalmasy	MDE
Lee Currey	MDE
Tom Thornton	MDE
Karl Berger	MWCOG
Norm Goulet	NVRC
Ben Sears	NY
Kristen Wolf	PA DEP
Kevin McGonigal	SRBC
Matt Johnston	UMD
Dave Koran	USACE
Scott Phillips	USGS
Russ Baxter	VA Secretary of Natural Resources Office
Eric Aschenbach	VDH
Chris Brosch	VT/VADCR
Dave Montali	WV DEP