**CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM**

**WATER QUALITY GOAL IMPLEMENTATION TEAM**

December 11, 2017 CONFERENCE CALL

Meeting Minutes

[Calendar Link](https://www.chesapeakebay.net/what/event/water_quality_goal_implementation_team_december_11_conference_call)

Summary of Actions and Decisions:

**Action**: Jurisdictional representatives interested in a communication product to assist in Phase III WIP development should contact Emily Trentacoste ([trentacoste.emily@epa.gov](mailto:trentacoste.emily@epa.gov)) for more information and to provide input on potential uses and content that should be included in this product.

**Decision:** 2013 progress data will be used to present current conditions at the December 19-20 PSC meeting.

**Action:** CBPO staff will meet with DOEE and DC Water representatives to review updates to wastewater flow information in the Phase 6 E3 and No Action scenarios available in CAST.

**Action:** EPA and CBPO staff will discuss current availability of EPA’s air allocation loads to address special case requests from NY and WV.

**Action:** Jurisdiction-specific packages of progress data and key Phase 6 scenarios will be distributed to jurisdictional representatives for review in preparation for the December 19-20 PSC meeting.

1:00 Welcome/Confirm Call Participants/Workgroup Updates – James Davis-Martin, WQGIT Chair

Announcements:

* The agenda for the December 19-20 PSC meeting is available on the PSC calendar [page](https://www.chesapeakebay.net/what/event/principals_staff_committee_meeting_december_2017).
* Michelle Williams will send out the request for STAC workshop proposals to the WQGIT.
* Nominations for chair, vice chair, at large positions are due to Michelle Williams by COB December 22. UPDATE: The nomination and voting timeline was extended for both membership and leadership positions.

1:10 Technical Outreach to Local Jurisdictions – Emily Trentacoste, EPA

Emily Trentacoste will inform the WQGIT on a proposed effort to work with local jurisdictional technical leads on assessing science needs and developing storylines of local government and local watershed monitoring progress and modeling forecasts.

*Discussion:*

* Trentacoste: Jurisdiction-specific technical outreach is expected to be conducted in early 2018. I’ve tried to showcase how we can synthesize information in these storylines to inform the Phase III WIPs. I’d like to set up meetings early next year to bring this work to the jurisdictions and get feedback on what would be most useful and what they want to see. We want to present draft storylines at those meetings as well and get feedback now for developing those storylines in advance of the meetings.
* Kristen Wolf: We are very interested in that and will be ready to go in the new year with scheduling these meetings in PA.
* James Davis-Martin: What is your target audience?
  + Trentacoste: Representatives from jurisdictional agencies.
* Trentacoste: USGS has a lot of these products, and there is an SAV synthesis being done, but these timelines don’t match with WIP development timelines, so we want to make sure you are getting materials to use in developing your WIPs. We will be following up with representatives to schedule those meetings early next year.
* Davis-Martin: There is a STAC workshop on this topic scheduled for tomorrow and Wed.

**Action**: Jurisdictional representatives interested in a communication product to assist in Phase III WIP development should contact Emily Trentacoste ([trentacoste.emily@epa.gov](mailto:trentacoste.emily@epa.gov)) for more information and to provide input on potential uses and content that should be included in this product.

1:15Updates to Planning Targets and Assimilative Capacity in the Phase 6 Modeling Tools – Matt Johnston, UMD; Jeff Sweeney, EPA CBPO; Gary Shenk, USGS

Matt, Jeff and Gary provided an [overview](https://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/25555/2017_12_11_wqgit_-_planning_target_changes.pdf) to the WQGIT of changes made to Phase 6 CAST to address concerns and issued raised by DE and DC. The WQGIT will be briefed on the impacts of these changes to the Chesapeake Bay’s assimilative capacity and changes to the results of the Phase III planning target calculations.

**Decision Requested:** WQGIT approval of the revised assimilative capacity in development of the Phase III planning targets.

*Discussion:*

* Jeff Sweeney: There have been some changes to the modeling and assimilation capacity since last week’s meeting that will affect the planning targets. The list of changes was in an email that was sent this morning. Those updates are also on the CAST website under upgrade history. One of the updates was simulating fertilizer inputs in the model.
* Matt Johnston: We tried to estimate what nutrient management would be worth in each state in terms of reductions. We had to investigate how the model was distributing fertilizer across the landscape.
* Sweeney: We also changed water-extractable phosphorus (WEP) estimates.
  + Johnston: There are counties that were split into land segments, and we think we’ve fixed that issue with the splits in this version.
* Sweeney: The other update of note is the update to flows for wastewater in DC for No Action and E3 scenarios. We found some errors in those flows in what was shown previously, and Katherine Antos noted the issue with DC’s key scenario levels at our Face-to-Face meeting last week. We will have a meeting with DOEE and DC Water to show the changes that were made and the new numbers.
* Ruth Izraeli: What does the change in nutrient loads mean for the calibration?
  + Sweeney: These changes don’t affect the calibration. These changes affect progress runs. We have updates to those progress runs, especially for 2016. In almost all cases, there were improvements in the loads up to 2016 using the fixes we introduced, with the exception of DE nitrogen and PA nitrogen. These updated progress runs are all available on CAST now for review.
  + Johnston: There is missing data from those jurisdictions—data that was not submitted to NEIEN that should have been, so we have to investigate that missing data.
* Dave Montali: The change in poultry numbers and manure—will those be included in the PSC presentation for next week?
  + Sweeney: Yes, and we wanted to show you those changes so that we can include these in the materials for the PSC.
* Alisha Mulkey: What data source was used for broilers?
  + Johnston: It’s the counts and the weights, using the NAS annual data. In this last update we used their 2014-2015 annual counts, as well as pounds produced for broilers.
* Sarah Diebel: What was the method for the turf grass application rate?
  + Sweeney: There are fertilizer sales and use, which we use to determine the change over time in total mass. We sum it by state, and the change in turf grass comes from our GIS team in analyzing historical data and we use a projection to forecast for 2025. We are taking that to get the application rate per acre of turf grass. We hold that application rate constant out through 2025. Changes to that would go into progress and be introduced into CAST that way. We are hoping to update this year’s rate and projections by next year when 2017 progress is submitted.
  + Diebel: Is federal land included in that?
    - Sweeney: Yes, so if federal land is in MD, turf grass on that land gets the MD rates.
* Norm Goulet: What about the issue in VA?
  + Sweeney: We found that with the bucket approach, we had to update it manually every time the land uses changed. Using the application rate reduces the amount of changes to buckets that we have to make.
* Diebel: We’d like to follow up with someone to discuss what else we should include with our progress data.
  + Sweeney: You can follow up with Norm or Tom on that.
* Ed Dunne: I want to thank the team for working on the planning targets the last few days.
* Lew Linker discussed these changes to CAST in context of previous WQGIT decisions (calibration unchanged, scenarios run through WQSTM have different meanings). Question for the WQGIT is whether we stick with planning targets based on the assimilation capacity we approved, or whether we develop planning targets based on the WIP II level of effort.
* Gary Shenk discussed differences among planning target options between a WIP II level of effort and planning target options based on the Phase 6 assimilation capacity.
* Linker: If we are looking at the loads, then nothing changes between those except for DC.
  + Shenk: We are still shooting for the 13.7 phosphorus loads but things move around because of changes in CAST.
  + Tanya Spano: I thought provisionally approving the numbers was based on the assumptions that the fixes would be made. We knew those numbers were draft, so I’m not sure why they’re back up for consideration. Have we reopened the WIP II level of effort back up for consideration here?
* Montali: What’s going on with the DC fix?
  + Shenk: There are other changes that went in as well, but we are keeping that assimilation capacity stable.
* Davis-Martin: We said that none of these changes affected calibration, only progress from 2014 onwards. Why are the planning targets changing then?
  + Shenk: They do affect the scenarios that we used to calculate planning targets. The WEP change applied to all scenarios. But the loads for calibration were calculated based on a database that Olivia Devereux calculated. So, this is only a change that affects CAST and not the loads that calibration is based on.
  + Davis-Martin: I understand that this may affect 2010 scenarios so we can’t say that it doesn’t affect anything before 2014.
    - Shenk: Right.
* Davis-Martin: I don’t think we should change our number for assimilation capacity—13.7 million lbs P and 195 million lbs N. I vote to hold at that level.
* Izraeli: The 0.5 million lbs P change, so why doesn’t the calibration use that information?
  + Shenk: There are two different calculation engines that calculate load based on WEP. The engine that we used for the calibration did not have the problem that CAST does.
* Diebel: The slide with the loading scenarios (slide 10). I thought we made the decision to take whatever loading scenario that got us to the no violations state.
  + Linker: We were wrong when we said the WIP II would be the assimilation capacity since the numbers no longer match. Did we mean the WIP II scenario or did we mean this number—195 and 13.7? That’s what the WQGIT has to answer.
  + Diebel: It seems like the same thing to me. I want to reiterate my previous recommendation to take all mention of WIPs off this graph and change to loading scenario—it’s going to be confusing for the PSC.
* Dianne McNally: If we decide to stay with the numbers rather than the Phase II WIP, then the variances for MD will be different than the numbers presented last week. The variances will be narrower?
  + Shenk: The variances will be what we saw last week if we stick with the decision we made last week.
  + McNally: There will be less areas out of attainment and they will have to seek lower variances? (e.g. 3-5% variance rather than 6%)
  + Linker: We don’t know yet.
  + McNally: We will need that information for the PSC meeting. But we don’t need that uncertainty if we stick with 195 million lbs for N and 13.7 million lbs P.
* Spano: The only change to planning targets would be that assimilative capacity for P is lower by 0.5 million lbs P (13.2 rather than 13.7), correct?
* Shenk: If we had made these corrections before coming to the WQGIT last week then we would have only made the recommendation on 195 N and 13.2 P.
* Spano: How are we characterizing this decision?
  + Linker: We have a long understanding that the deepest portion of CB4 has long term nonattainment. We know that no matter what we do, we will probably have about 6% nonattainment.
  + Spano: So we’ve reached the point of diminishing returns there.
* Dinorah Dalmasy: The WQ standards attainment calculations don’t change?
  + Linker: We have run the 13.7 but not the 13.2, but we think that the change in assimilative capacity will not change attainment by any discernable amount, considering we look at attainment in whole numbers.
  + Dalmasy: The planning targets overall would stay the same since attainment isn’t changing in response to the change in assimilative capacity?
* Shenk: The restoration variances are only after the WIPs are done. We want to hear whether we want to stick with load or intent of the scenario, and the consensus seems to be to stick with load.
* Montali: My recommendation is to run at 195 N and 13.7 P and stick with that.
* Diebel: I’m not opposed but I think we need to be able to explain why we’ve made the decision we have.
* Davis-Martin: I like your suggestion to get rid of the scenario names and just have the loading scenario numbers in the axis labels for the graphs. I’d like to go back to the new planning targets that result from this change and discuss those.
* Shenk: The No Action and E3 scenarios also changed due to some of the changes made in CAST.
* Davis-Martin: What confidence do we have here that these changes are the final changes?
* Dunne: Last week we agreed on the methods assuming that this error would be changed. We understand that that shift of numbers resulted in a shift across jurisdictions.
* Spano: Can we use the word correction—not a discretionary decision, it was a correction?
* Davis-Martin: Do changes in relative effectiveness explain the changes in VA as well?
  + Shenk: There are changes in E3 for other jurisdictions due to these changes.
  + Sweeney: If you change something in one state basin then it will change all the others to account for these changes.
  + Shenk: The target moves as No Action and E3 move—that doesn’t affect your starting place—your progress runs. We can look into why historical progress hasn’t changed, although we’ve received direction not to rerun historical progress at this time.
* Davis-Martin: I’m worried about presenting information to the PSC that we are still uncertain about.
  + Linker: The uncertainty is actually improving as we move forward with this review and requested fixes.
* Spano: We saw numbers that haven’t been vetted and we thought they were more final than they actually were.
* Davis-Martin: If we continue with these numbers there is just as much possibility that these will change as well.
  + Linker: We are making corrections that we knew in last week’s meeting that we would have to look into. As we finish these reviews and corrections we get closer and closer to a final model.
* George Onyullo: We approved these numbers in DC with an understanding that the issues we raised would be investigated and corrected prior to recommendations made to the PSC. So any changes here were expected as part of these corrections.
  + Davis-Martin: That’s right, but the concern here is that that’s not the last change that will be made prior to the PSC meeting.
  + Spano: Won’t we be expecting these numbers to change as a result of the 4-month review and the updates to MD’s restoration variances?
* Davis-Martin: That’s right, and we are expecting these numbers to change almost certainly because of special cases and changes in EPA’s air allocations. We should note that. However, VA is getting the largest increase in effort for Phase III and 2025 growth, and I don’t know why that’s the case.
  + Shenk: We will be updating these numbers with new ones. This is the best understanding that we have today, and they are still draft. We will send out an updated table after we get the new numbers in.
* Davis-Martin: We need approval from the WQGIT for the assimilative capacity at 195 N and 13.7 P.
  + Lucinda Power: We did not come to consensus at last week’s meeting on the planning targets because of these outstanding issues. We’d like a recommendation from the WQGIT, but we understand if we don’t have time to get consensus. We can present this information to the PSC without a full WQGIT recommendation.
* James Davis-Martin called for consensus on the proposal to recommend PSC adoption of an assimilative capacity at 195 million lbs nitrogen and 13.7 million lbs phosphorus:
  + DC agreed.
  + Hassan Mirsajadi: The Modeling Team is evaluating the changes with DE.
  + Teresa Koon: WV cannot approve the draft planning targets without assurance of the partners addressing our special case request.
  + Lauren Townley: We will consider this decision but we need assurance to grant special cases for NY and WV before moving forward with draft planning targets.
* Koon: Is it possible for the WQGIT to recommend to the PSC to move forward with special cases being honored?
  + Davis-Martin: We can revisit that issue and ask that the PSC strongly consider the previous special case decisions that were approved when the Bay TMDL was developed.
  + McNally: We know that our air reductions in this model aren’t as high, but whatever pounds EPA does have should be given to NY and WV.
  + Koon: Aren’t special cases going to be reviewed by the WQGIT before going to the PSC?
  + Davis-Martin: Those special cases probably won’t be honored exactly as they were before.
* Diebel: Are you asking about using consistent methodology from before? Or are you asking for the exact numeric allocation that was given in 2010?
  + Koon: We would want the equivalent to what was provided to WV in the Bay TMDL
  + Montali: Our governor will probably want what was honored in our WIP, but there are a lot of interpretations of what that might mean for Phase III.
  + Koon: Given that the next 4 months is devoted to a review of the planning targets, we have some room to determine what that would mean.
* Davis-Martin: We will have some time during the 4-month review process to determine what that special case process might entail.
* Russ Baxter: I am still uncomfortable with the idea that the WQGIT will not be making a formal recommendation on the planning targets to the PSC.
  + Davis-Martin: We will have numbers to present but we can’t make a recommendation
  + Baxter: Why would we go to the PSC without a recommendation?
  + Davis-Martin: The timeline requires it.
  + Baxter: I am uncomfortable with going to the PSC when we should be the ones making the technical call on this. Why are we asking the PSC to deliberate over that when it’s not their role to do?
  + Davis-Martin: What Tanya suggested is that what we are approving are draft planning targets that will be reviewed over the next 4 months.
* Power: On the technical side, a lot of these issues have been worked out, especially regarding the issues raised by DC and DE. A lot of these outstanding issues are policy decisions that the PSC is in a good position to make—special case concerns for NY and WV and the policy questions around the review process.
  + Baxter: The special cases seem to be technical issues that the PSC might ask the WQGIT and Modeling Workgroup to work out and come back. The PSC are not experts on the implications of the special cases, those have to be vetted through this technical committee.
  + Power: We are not presenting final planning targets. In 2010 there were special cases awarded to WV and NY. We can’t begin those discussions until we have draft planning targets as a starting point.
  + Baxter: If our starting point is what is being presented today, why does the PSC have to sign off on something that’s a work in progress?
* Diebel: What did the PSC do in this situation for Phase II planning targets?
  + Davis-Martin: In the past, planning targets were issued from EPA to the jurisdictions. Here, we want the planning targets to be a Partnership decision. That may be the failsafe if we can’t make a decision here.
  + Linker: That was a court-mandated decision—that was delivered to the states to work on. But now, we have no court mandate and now we have to come to collective decisions on how to move forward. These are appropriate decision points to put to the PSC and remind them that we will be coming back after the review to resolve outstanding issues.
* Power: Will we be using 2013 or 2016 progress to do the comparison between where we are now and where we need to be by 2025?
  + Sweeney: 2016 progress was due December 1. That information is now available to states for review. In the meantime, we need to update slides for the PSC with the current condition. We can use 2013 or 2016 for those who can review this week, or use some combination.
  + Johnston: Perhaps 2013 is more accurate than 2016 given how little time there is to review 2016 progress.
  + Sweeney: Or you could do some combination with current conditions.
  + Diebel: You could include current conditions and then highlight 2013 with a note that 2016 is still draft.
  + Sweeney: We could do that.
  + McNally: It would make sense for the PSC to have a consistent set of numbers, we don’t want to mix and match numbers for the PSC unless they can be clearly presented.
  + Mirsajadi: We will have to look at what Jeff has provided and give an answer later this week.
* Diebel: Asking the PSC to make a decision on something that we can’t make a recommendation on seems a little uncertain. Maybe phrasing some of these issues in a more policy based context would be better, rather than going into the technical weeds.
  + Power: Agreed, but according to our governance protocols, the PSC’s role is to step in if the WQGIT cannot come to consensus on policy decisions. We like to avoid that, but sometimes it is necessary and it is appropriate for the PSC to step in and make that call.
  + Baxter: But the WQGIT’s work here isn’t done.
  + Power: We are making it clear that the planning targets are draft and subject to a 4-month review.
  + Baxter: Why is there a policy decision for a process that is still incomplete?
    - Power: The WQGIT does not make final decisions on the planning targets, so we need approval from the PSC before kicking off the 4-month review period.
* Davis-Martin: There was the question from WV and NY on special cases, and there are other technical issues that are holding others back from making recommendations.
* McNally: I do want to go on the record that whatever air allocations we have even if they are diminished, we want those to go to WV and NY for special cases.
* Power: On progress—we will label this as current conditions, and 2016 progress will be used for all jurisdictions except PA and DE—that will be based on 2013 progress. We have to distribute those state profiles to each rep and the PSC members.
  + Davis-Martin: That’s too confusing—just use 2013 for all.
  + No objections heard.
  + Koon: The numbers for 2016 progress—those are still close to what they were last week or could they be different?
    - Sweeney: In most states they are a little different but in some they didn’t change. There are profiles available on today’s calendar page, and all the progress up to 2016 is available on CAST. If you want a comparison to the planning targets, Gary will have to recalculate that information for you.

**Decision:** 2013 progress data will be used to present current conditions at the PSC December 19-20 meeting.

**Action:** CBPO staff will meet with DOEE and DC water representatives to review updates to wastewater flow information in the Phase 6 E3 and No Action scenarios available in CAST.

2:45 Process and Timeline for Review of the Draft Phase III Planning Targets – Lucinda Power, EPA CBPO

Lucinda presented the revised draft process and timeline [paper](https://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/25555/partnership_review_of_the_draft_phase_iii_wip_planning_targets_v11.7.17.pdf) for review of the draft Phase III planning targets. Requested revisions included a proposed process to ensure transparency of documented issues, comments and questions; and a separate detailed timeline for notification and submittal of special case requests.

**Decision Requested:** WQGIT approval of the revised process and timeline for review of the draft Phase III planning targets.

*Discussion:*

* Power: If you have other considerations or analyses you want conducted, please contact people at the CBPO.
* Izraeli: For what’s available for WV and NY from other states loads—what about the possibility of using EPA discretion to provide as much air allocation as we have right now—we can make that decision before the PSC meeting that we will distribute those pounds to WV and NY.
  + Power: Let’s discuss that offline.
* Montali: Maybe we are discussing this too early but EPA needs to make a decision on how much they will have to give by various dates and factor in the achievement of practices on the ground to 2025. The EPA should make an internal decision and then relay that to the jurisdictions.
  + McNally: Is that an assurance that you are asking to be included in this document?
  + Power: We still need to conduct those assessments, so it may be premature to include that information right now before we have those assessments done—those will also be conducted during the 4-month review.
* Davis-Martin: Once we have completed that assessment, we will know what we have to address towards special cases. We will be able to take that to the PSC to inform how much we can do for special cases and distributing that load.
* McNally: The PSC decided to use the TMDL methods for determining the planning targets. What does that mean for special cases?
  + Izraeli: This still needs to be resolved internally within EPA, so we need to have some internal discussion on that.
* Power: NY has requested additional language from the Bay TMDL document on why NY needs those special cases be included in this review document.
* Suggested language from NY: “The Partnership recognizes that the special cases previously afforded to WV and NY in the 2010 Chesapeake Bay TMDL and will use the 4-month review period to determine if similar adjustments can be provided to WV and NY in the establishment of the final Phase III planning targets.”
* Davis-Martin: The special case intro paragraph in Appendix A—is it clear that exchanges are special cases or not?
  + Power: We consider those exchanges to be part of the normal review process.
  + Davis-Martin: It’s not clear in this paragraph—it should be explicitly excluded from this appendix.
* Spano: What qualifies as a special case?
  + Power: We thought we would add a footnote that special cases exclude all the conditions listed in that first paragraph referring to normal activities in the planning targets review.
* Davis-Martin: It’s easier to ask EPA to approve special cases as a third party. But, the Partnership is best served if we collectively decide on our own collective best interests.
  + Izraeli: There’s a lot of uncertainty at this point with the numbers, but maybe it will become clearer as we move forward.
  + Montali: If it’s a PSC decision that we don’t like then we can vote against it at the May PSC meeting. We need to let the next 4 months work out to see if special case states can make a good argument—but if we can’t, there is a TMDL that allocates loads for different reasons.
  + Davis-Martin: So we should let it play out—it would be good for the Partnership to decide but it would be more certain if the decision was EPA’s.
* McNally: I think of special cases as two bins—those that were awarded before to NY and WV, and new ones that might arise during the 4-month review.
* Power: I’ll note NY’s position, and maybe add some language on what happens if consensus isn’t reached or we can’t make decisions on the final planning targets. That could be EPA but let’s identify now what to do as contingencies.
* Davis-Martin: We could have that as a fallback position. Does that mean that if PSC makes a decision and denies the special case request, could EPA override that decision?
  + Power: There are two options here—EPA could make the final decision or we could go with a supermajority vote at the PSC level—what are we and the PSC comfortable with?
  + JDM: That’s a reasonable approach to provide options to the PSC for this process.
  + Batiuk: A supermajority is 7 out of 9 signatory partners of the PSC.
* Batiuk: We need to figure out how to move this issue forward. We aren’t modifying the TMDL but we are implementing adaptive management and the new science available to implement the TMDL.
* Izraeli: In addition to the slides that were shared last week—could we have the proposed draft N and P targets?
  + Power: Each state will receive specific packages of progress and scenarios data and planning targets by this Wednesday.

**Action:** EPA and CBPO staff will discuss current availability of EPA’s air allocation loads to address special case requests from NY and WV.

**Action:** Jurisdiction-specific packages of progress data and key Phase 6 scenarios will be distributed to jurisdictional representatives for review in preparation for the December 19-20 PSC meeting.

3:20 Review of Key Actions, Decisions, and Recommendations from the December 4-5 Face-to-Face Meeting

WQGIT review of key decisions and recommendations from the December 4-5, 2017 Face-to-Face meeting, including recommendations on Conowingo, climate change, accounting for growth, the Bay’s assimilative capacity, and draft Phase III WIP planning targets. Final recommendations of the WQGIT will be presented to the PSC for review and approval at the December 19-20, 2017 PSC meeting.

*Discussion*:

* Mirsajadi: We will be able to finish an evaluation of the nutrient management fix in the model by the end of this week and will approve the planning targets if we find the fix sufficient.
* Power: We had consensus at the WQGIT Face-to-Face meeting in September to use 2025 growth projections to account for growth (explicitly) in the Phase III WIPs.
* Power: We will work to update the historic trends data with the updates from Friday.
* Dalmasy: Should we include a reminder in that recommendation that MD is planning to use our own projections when they become available? This was approved at a previous PSC meeting.
  + Power: We approved that at the September WQGIT Face-to-Face. We can add language to this presentation that acknowledges that.
  + Dalmasy: The timing has changed for us. We will start reviewing the planning targets with the CBP projections and will switch to using our own next year.
* Koon: We also want to note that we will be including milestones data to update the growth forecasts on a two-year basis as we move closer to 2025.
* Conowingo recommendations:
  + Diebel: What about non-jurisdictional stakeholders like Exelon? Should we include a provision in this recommendation that non-jurisdictional stakeholders are encouraged to take part in this planning process?
* Koon: Regarding the by-2025 deadline, there is some urgency with Exelon and MD negotiations, but the Partnership may not be able to do the implementation by 2025.
* McNally: We didn’t make a decision on who would be responsible for implementing these reductions—that still needs to be decided.
* Davis-Martin: We have concerns about all of these recommendations from a VA standpoint because the numbers have changed, and VA reps were not in the room during these conversations. I wrote comments in the chat and offered language to Lee Currey and I don’t see any of VA’s recommendations reflected in the language in the PSC presentation. VA can’t stand by a lot of these recommendations, and we are uncomfortable with these policy issues being represented as WQGIT recommendations since we were not able to contribute to the conversation.
* Spano: I was under the impression that we did not come to consensus on a lot of these issues, and that we are representing these issues to the PSC as discussions and progress we have made but not as WQGIT recommendations since we did not come to full consensus.
* Davis-Martin: On slide 146: for Conowingo, VA can support the effective basins options, but there are different effectiveness values for N and P.
  + Shenk: It was our impression that the different relative effectiveness values were something the WQGIT wanted to consider.
* Montali: I thought that no state would get a Conowingo-specific load to reduce, but the relative effectiveness didn’t concern me because we will not be given these loads to reduce in our WIPs as they will be dealt with in another way.
* Rich Batiuk: Can we reflect that VA is comfortable with the current option for effective basins?
  + Davis-Martin: That would be ok for VA.
* Koon: WV did not think that we would be affected in this decision.
  + Batiuk: Right, if the PSC accepts any of the Susquehanna + effective basins scenarios, then WV is not affected. VA only has one effective basin—VA’s Eastern Shore. The PSC requested enumeration on all 4 options, and we are reflecting that there is an N component to these reductions as well. The WQGIT is not making a recommendation on any of these responsibility scenarios, we are just trying to lay out a 5th policy option.
* James Davis-Martin made several recommendations on changes to the Conowingo policy recommendation on slides 151, 152, 153, 154 (see [presentation](https://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/25555/psc_dec_19_2017_mpa_policy_decisions_briefing_presentation_story_board-12.6.17_compressed.pdf) on calendar page for updated language).
  + Diebel: Are we recommending that the “all jurisdictions” scenario be be taken off the table for load distributions?
  + Davis-Martin: We are not recommending that but we are suggesting that it may be appropriate to take it off the table.
* There was discussion of the timeline (by 2025 or post 2025) for developing and implementing necessary reductions for Conowingo infill.
* Discussion of dates to achieve actions in climate change recommendations (slide 177 – 179).
  + Power: We could start with an early 2021 date to identify the gaps in knowledge and tools that we need to address this problem.
  + Linker: We decided that local concerns would be factored into these projections for climate change and implementation measures.

4:00 Adjourned
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