

CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM
WATER QUALITY GOAL IMPLEMENTATION TEAM
August 24th, 2009 Conference Call

SUMMARY OF DECISIONS, ACTIONS, AND ISSUES

[Revised Guidelines for Watershed Implementation Plans](#) – Katherine Antos

ACTION: CBPO will prepare a presentation for the states on Scenario Builder and NEIEN.

ACTION: Workgroup member can provide more feedback necessary to Katherine at antos.katherine@epa.gov.

[Review of Watershed Model Phase 4.3 vs. 5.2](#) – Gary Shenk

ACTION: Rich Batiuk will send Clifton Bell's analysis of the hydrologic period to the WQGIT members.

ACTION: Gary Shenk will attempt to provide the jurisdiction with their data requests.

MINUTES

[Revised Guidelines for Watershed Implementation Plans](#) – Katherine Antos

Katherine Antos updated WQGIT members on the changes that have been made to the guidance on state watershed implementation plans since ([Attachment A](#)).

- Includes feedback from WQSC July 6th, PSC July 7th, and WQSC workgroups

Slide 5

- Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) would include Waste Load Allocation (WLA) + Load Allocation (LA) by sector
- Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP) would include reduction by segment, need specific load allocation by sector in tidal states. WIP includes planned program enhancement, dates, possible controls, dates for those controls, etc. Some areas have very large drainage areas so plans would need further breakdown of target at county level.

Slide 6

- Many names for WIP, pursuant to sec. 117 referencing need to develop and implement management plans to meet Water Quality (WQ) goals, but WIP also supports demonstration of reasonable assurance. Not using State Implementation Plans (SIP) so as not to confuse with SIPS under Clean Air Act (CAA).
- Schedule links WIP to milestones, which will be used for reasonable assurance
- When modeling and monitoring data conflicts the watershed model can be modified to correct this over time if necessary. Still need model to account for years with high rainfall, when monitoring data would show poor results.
- John Kennedy, VA DEQ, is concerned about the expectation for program enhancements given budgetary concerns. Katherine Antos, EPA, clarifies that they are looking at over long term. With current fiscal situation it would be unreasonable to see program enhancement over next few years. Some could come through different use of regulatory authority, permit review, cost share programs, etc. Each takes a different type of resource commitment, just need to know strategy will work. If can't increase cost-share maybe you could expand regulatory authority. Bob Koroncai, EPA, added that there is a menu of state options to meet requirements. Not hard line commitment for what will be delivered, that will be in milestones.

Slide 7

- In WIP and future 2 year milestones state needs to have alternative option if plan A is not working.
- Asking states to identify every necessary control would be waste of time since not all possible controls are known. We are working on protocol to get new practices and controls into model. Still require some location info. Specify reduction from a particular sector for each area, just not by which specific practice.

Slide 9

- Most important is getting controls on the ground by 2025 as governors committed to
- ACTION:** CBPO will prepare a presentation for the states on Scenario Builder and National Environmental Information Exchange Network (NEIEN).
- Teresa Koon, WV DEP, expressed concern about requiring permits contracts with quantifiable limits because it would be difficult to do in WV given the automated system.

Slide 10

Slide 11

- Looked at different options for interim, wanted it to be based on something. TS load is a familiar reference point. State partners have said that was is in TS may no longer be relevant, so states are not being required to implement TS, just meat load reduction target by any method. Aren't saying every state has to meet individual TS load, taking overall load and proposing to use same allocation methodology for basin-wide cap to allocate TS load. Same equity.

Slide 12

- Schedule is basin wide, targets are by sector. EPA would look at if you are staying on schedule and if you are then they will not look at what you did by sector
- Pat Buckley, PA DEP, disagrees with the sectors because PA finds them too specific. Katherine Antos explained that they had to be separate from wastewater because that goes in the WLA.

Slide 14

- Also we expect loads broken down by county. Local decision makers need to know where they are now, interim target, and final. It's okay if more reduction is coming from one sector
- We need more specificity for larger drainage area. Wouldn't be practical to do by township. Many inputs come in at county scale. In states that don't have strong county government, there is still county council. Focusing on reduction schedule for major basin overall, just need to meet schedule somehow.

Slide 16

- States would propose milestone, EPA would consider, CBPO would ensure how it is getting into model, NEIEN, etc. EPA's commitment to evaluate is part of demonstration of reasonable assurance. That's why we can back off up front commitment.

Discussion:

- Russ Perkinson expressed several concerns; first with using TS level for interim step, perhaps we should look at WQ measure for some subset of impairment, realizing that there is DO impairment right now. Secondly, attempting to plan beyond stage one at this point, because they are still asked to identify overall programmatic, budget enhancements all the way to the endpoint. In NPS they're having trouble determining regulations, etc. that could go in WIP without determining BMPs that will achieve stage one. Katherine Antos clarified that EPA wants an input deck not to identify controls, but a reduction target, such as getting agricultural reduction from specific counties with high delivery rates. We can make available the current controls in the model and efficiencies and load reductions in current model. Workgroups will bring forward new controls and other changes can happen over time.

ACTION: Workgroup member can provide more feedback necessary to Katherine Antos at antos.katherine@epa.gov.

Review of Watershed Model Phase 4.3 vs. 5.2 – Gary Shenk

Gary Shenk presented the general difference between phase 4.3 and phase 5.2 of the watershed model ([Attachment B](#)).

Slide 2

- Arrow indicator delivered load change direction caused by change listed

ACTION: Rich Batiuk will send Clifton Bell's analysis of the hydrologic period to the WQGIT members.

Slide 3

- Changes from 4.3 to 5.2 in small steps
- 2nd bar is 4.3 hydrology, 4.3 point sources, just change in data & calibration method
- 3rd adds in coastal plain delivery
- 4th adds below fall line point sources
- Final step is change in averaging period, wetter but controls in place, overall slight decrease
- TN calibration overall didn't change very much for calibration loads
- The critical period speaks to how far we need to go in total reduction, hydrologic period speaks to geographic distribution, need to pick a period that is same across all basins, not when one basin is causing most of load.

Slide 4

- Tidal monitoring station loads are not included because they cannot be calibrated to.

Slide 7

- Phase 4.3 did not account for temporal changes in input
- About 10 million lb per year reduction in atmospheric deposition
- Will have effect in terms of how 1985 are to calibration load

Slide 9

- Temporal signal is having the effect of pushing scenario loads up from calibration loads
- Can also see hydrologic difference

Slide 12

- Change mainly due to change in efficiencies from MAWP between phase 4.3 and 5.2

Slide 13

ACTION: Gary Shenk will attempt to provide the jurisdiction with their data requests.

Review of Schedule for Upcoming WQGIT Calls and Meetings – Bob Koroncai

Bob reviewed changes to the WQGIT schedule to prepare for delivering major basin-jurisdiction nutrient targets to the PSC on October 23, including an additional call on September 21st ([Attachment C](#)).

- September 9th & 21st calls will be 3 hours long to accommodate volume of material
- For face-to-face meeting will be at Willow Valley in Lancaster, PA.
- Looking for one to two recommendations for allocation methodology
- October 5th for unfinished business, follow-ups, PSC package due on October 7th

PARTICIPANTS

Bob Koroncai, Chair	EPA R3	koroncai.robert@epa.gov
Katherine Antos	EPA/CBPO	antos.katherine@epa.gov
Rich Batiuk	EPA/CBPO	batiuk.richard@epa.gov
Bill Brannon	WV DEP	william.d.brannon@wv.gov
Pat Buckley	PA DEP	pbuckley@state.pa.us
Arthur Butt	VA DEQ	ajbutt@deq.virginia.gov
Monir Chowdhury	DC DOE	monir.chowdhury@dc.gov
Lee Currey	MDE	lcurrey@mde.state.md.us
Tom Damm	EPA/CBPO	damm.thomas@epa.gov
Chris Day	EPA Region III	day.christopher@epa.gov
Norm Goulet	NVRC	ngoulet@novaregion.org
Ted Graham	MWCOG	tgraham@mwkog.org
Dave Hansen	U. of Delaware	djhansen@udel.edu
Bill Keeling	VA DCR	william.keeling@dcr.virginia.gov
John Kennedy	VA DEQ	jmkennedy@deq.virginia.gov
Teresa Koon	WV DEP	teresa.m.koon@wv.gov
Charles Martin	VA DEQ	chmartin@deq.virginia.gov
James Davis-Martin	VA DCR	james.davis-martin@dcr.virginia.gov
Beth McGee	CBF	bmcgee@cbf.org
Bruce Michael	MD DNR	bmichael@dnr.state.md.us
Matt Mullins	CBC	mmullin@chesbay.us
Lisa Ochsenhirt	AquaLaw	lisa@aqualaw.com
Kenn Pattison	PA DEP	kpattison@state.pa.us
Russ Perkinson	VA DCR	russ.perkinson@dcr.virginia.gov
Alan Pollock	VA DEQ	aepollock@deq.virginia.gov
John Schneider	DE DNREC	john.schneider@state.de.us
Mohsin Siddique	DC WASA	mohsin_siddique@dcwasa.com
Tanya Spano	MWCOG	tspano@mwkog.org
Rachel Streusand	CRC/CBP	rstreusa@chesapeakebay.net
Jeff Sweeney	CBPO/UMD	jsweeney@chesapeakebay.net
Tom Thornton	MDE	tthornton@mde.state.md.us
Sara Walker	WRI	swalker@wri.org
Bob Yowell	PA DEP	ryowell@state.pa.us