

**CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM
WATER QUALITY GOAL IMPLEMENTATION TEAM**

APRIL 19TH, 2010 CONFERENCE CALL MINUTES

SUMMARY OF DECISION AND ACTION ITEMS

Review/Approval of Revised Basinwide Nutrient Target Loads – Lewis Linker

ACTION: CBPO will follow up with VA on the use of reference curves in assessing SAV attainment.

DECISION: The WQGIT approved continuing to use 200 million lbs TN and 15 million lbs TP as working targets loads until further model runs are available.

Urban Land Use in Phase 5.2 versus 5.3 – Peter Claggett

ACTION: The CBP Watershed Technical Workgroup will consider development of bare land to better reflect permitting of new construction.

DECISION: The WQGIT approved the proposed course of action for correcting the Phase 5.3 load use with CBP WQGIT workgroup input. New York is concerned about equity in land use.

Review of Phase 5.3 Watershed Model Scenarios – Gary Shenk and Jeff Sweeney

ACTION: CBPO/Gary Shenk will follow up with Dave Montali on West Virginia's total phosphorus loads in phase 5.3 compared to phase 5.2.

ACTION: CBPO/Lewis Linker will perform a sensitivity analysis to determine the source of impairments and the sensitivity to load reductions for small watersheds.

Task Workgroups to Identify Critical Items to Address in Phase 5.3 – Bob Koroncai

ACTION: Identify critical items to address in Phase 5.3 model for the PSC by April, 21st, all issues by May 3rd.

MINUTES

Review/Approval of Revised Basinwide Nutrient Target Loads – Lewis Linker

Slide 8 – areas of persistent non-attainment generally should not have been included in the first place or should be assessed with SAV reference curve. Non-attainment in POTTF may be due to errors in processing

Slide 11

ACTION: CBPO will follow up with VA on the use of reference curves in assessing SAV attainment.

- Most likely that the Tributary Strategy loads will look more like the target loads
- Loads will continue to be adjusted for local water quality standards, etc.

State Feedback:

Proposed to present the PSC with the previous target load of 200 million lbs TN, 15 million lbs TP with qualifiers and the loading from atmospheric deposition:

NY – Not bad to inform the PSC. Dissented to including in the past because the number means more to people than it should. Should include the atmospheric deposition loading. Should present former loading, qualifiers, etc.

PA – no proof that less than 200 is better than 200, should include as qualifier. Schedule and level of work makes December completion date ridiculous

WV – need to have loads that meet the standards. In the same ballpark. Should look at higher loading, and work on local streams may lead to lower overall bay loading than target load meeting main stem water quality

MD – do not have support for why the load was reduced, especially since it still does not meet water quality standards. This is still a target load that is going to be changed

DC – this is not a big issue as load as the numbers are explained and qualified

DE – agree with everything, don't have final allocations

VA – suggest that working targets remain where they are

DECISION: The WQGIT approved continuing to use 200 million lbs TN and 15 million lbs TP as working targets loads until further model runs are available.

Urban Land Use in Phase 5.2 versus 5.3 – Peter Claggett

- Phase 5.3 model underestimates urban land use in the watershed
- USGS developed new land use data sets to create consistency across states and time period
- Data for phase 5.3 is from satellite imagery without ancillary information, leading to a very different estimate of urban land area and leaving out pervious land
- Improved extent of extractive land use in phase 5.3 with state data. Some urban area were converted to this use
- Proposed changes to correct for these issues include:
 - Updating extent of impervious surface based on ancillary data, including roads and housing
 - Extent of urban land would increase in the next phase with these corrections
 - Can capture 2/3 of what we missed with these corrections, cannot capture 5-20 acre lots with current data - would remain in forest land use
- Model changes for land use and nutrient management could occur concurrently
- Addresses concerns expressed by Rolband at Wetland Studies and Solutions Inc.

ACTION: The CBP Watershed Technical Workgroup will consider development of bare land to better reflect permitting of new construction.

DECISION: The WQGIT approved the proposed course of action for correcting the Phase 5.3 load use with CBP WQGIT workgroup input. New York is concerned about equity in land use.

Review of Phase 5.3 Watershed Model Scenarios – Gary Shenk and Jeff Sweeney

- Have updated scenarios, will continue to update and add scenarios
- 2009 scenarios expected this week, Tributary Strategy by next Monday

ACTION: CBPO/Gary Shenk will follow up with Dave Montali on West Virginia's total phosphorus loads in phase 5.3 compared to phase 5.2.

Slide 3 – James loading difference is due to moving the averaging period from 1985-1994 to 1991-2000; there were large point source P load reductions in the late 1980s

Slide 5 – all states decrease in TP under the P-based nutrient management (NM)

Slide 9, 10 – a much lower allocation, 186 TN, 10.8 TP, has large effect on all other sources' level of effort

- Revisions to No Action and E3: small details, will do in the next several weeks
- If we decide to go to phase 5.4 then we would not continue with these scenarios. Want to consider the results of these scenarios in the decision to make proposed model revisions.

ACTION: CBPO/Lewis Linker will perform a sensitivity analysis to determine the source of impairments and the sensitivity to load reductions for small watersheds.

Task Workgroups to Identify Critical Items to Address in Phase 5.3 – Bob Koroncai

- Have asked the workgroup chairs to identify issues today, with full inventory by May 3rd
- Consider if low, medium or high importance and impact for the model
- Also consider if it changes how the model calculates loads (current priority), definitions to key scenarios, or affects how states put together WIPs

Agriculture Workgroup (Frank Coale):

1. updating pasture management issues: expert panel has already met
2. update how winter cover crops are handled: recommendation coming shortly
3. [nutrient management application](#) and loading rates: currently evolving, recommendation in a matter of weeks
4. advanced nutrient management
5. accounting for continuous no till agricultural land

Urban Stormwater Workgroup (Norm Goulet): Issues to be address immediately include:

- Difference between phase 5.2 and 5.3 land use covers
- E3 definitions for urban stormwater: infiltration across all urban lands, not technically feasible
- Definition of MS4 boundaries: important for wasteload allocation

Wastewater Workgroup (Tanya Spano):

- Wastewater issues mostly affect how states put together their WIPs
- Don't have meeting until 22nd

Watershed Technical Workgroup (Bill Keeling):

- Lack time to do a through review. Issues related to percent cover, which affects sediment delivery
- Recommend that there not be BMPs only applicable to E3, AFO issue
- For Phase II WIP: TP and sediment disconnect on certain land uses, 2010 No Action definition

ACTION: Identify critical items to address in Phase 5.3 model for the PSC by April, 21st, all issues by May 3rd.

- Cannot consider anything proposed after May 3rd for this version of the model

PARTICIPANTS

Greg Allen	EPA/CBPO	allen.greg@epa.gov
Vimal Amin	MDE	vamin@mde.state.md.us
Katherine Antos, Coordinator	EPA/CBPO	antos.katherine@epa.gov
Rich Batiuk	EPA/CBPO	batiuk.richard@epa.gov
Karl Berger	MWCOG	kberger@mwkog.org
Steve Bieber	MWCOG	sbieber@mwkog.org
Karl Blankenship	Bay Journal	bayjournal@earthlink.net
Sally Bradley	Water Stewardship	sallyb@waterstewardshipinc.org
Chris Brosch	UMD/CBPO	cbrosch@chesapeakebay.net
Pat Buckley	PA DEP	pbuckley@state.pa.us
Collin Burrell	DDOE	collin.burrell@dc.gov
Arthur Butt	VA DEQ	ajbutt@deq.virginia.gov
Monir Chowdhury	DDOE	monir.chowdhury@dc.gov
Frank Coale	UMD	fjcoale@umd.edu
Lee Currey	MDE	lcurrey@mde.state.md.us
Tom Damm	EPA R3	damm.tomas@epa.gov
Chris Day	EPA R3	day.christopher@epa.gov
Dinorah Dalamsy	MDE	ddalmasy@mde.state.md.us
Rusty Diamond	PA DEP	rdiamond@state.pa.us
Mark Dubin	UMD/MAWP/CBPO	mdubin@chesapeakebay.net
Ron Entringer	NY DEC	raentrin@gw.dec.state.ny.us
Rich Eskin	MDE	reskin@mde.state.md.us
Kelly Gable	EPA R3	gable.kelly@epa.gov
Patricia Gleason	EPA R3	gleason.patricia@epa.gov
Norm Goulet	NVRC	ngoulet@novaregion.org
Steve Hann	HRMM&L	shann@hrmml.com
Dave Hansen, Chair	U. of Delaware	djhansen@udel.edu
Carlton Haywood	ICPRB	chaywood@icprb.org
Beth Horsey	MDA	horseyea@mda.state.md.us
Will Hunley	HRSD	whunley@hrsd.com
Bill Keeling	VA DCR	william.keeling@dcr.virginia.gov
Teresa Koon	WV DEP	teresa.m.koon@wv.gov
Bob Koroncai, Chair	EPA R3	Koroncai.robert@epa.gov
Sara Lane	MD DNR	slane@dnr.state.md.us
Lewis Linker	EPA/CBPO	linker.lewis@epa.gov
Marya Levelev	MDE	mlevelev@mde.state.md.us
Beth McGee	CBF	bmcgee@cbf.org
Bruce Michael	MD DNR	bmichael@dnr.state.md.us
Matt Monroe	WV DEP	mmonroe@ag.state.wv.us
Dave Montali	WV DEP	david.a.montali@wv.gov
Matt Mullin	CBC	mmullin@chesbay.us
Kenn Pattison	PA DEP	kpattison@state.pa.us
Robin Pellicano	MDE	rpellicano@mde.state.md.us
Russ Perkinson	VA DCR	russ.perkinson@dcr.virginia.gov
Alan Pollock	VA DEQ	aepollock@deq.virginia.gov

Ed Reilly	NY DEC	exreilly@gw.dec.state.ny.us
John Rhoderick	MDA	rhoderjc@mda.state.md.us
John Schneider	DE DNREC	john.schneider@state.de.us
Gary Shenk	EPA/CBPO	gshenk@chesapeakebay.net
Tanya Spano	MWCOG	tspano@mwkog.org
Helen Stewart	MD DNR	hstewart@dnr.state.md.us
Rachel Streusand	CRC/CBP	rstreusa@chesapeakebay.net
Jeff Sweeney	UMCP/CBPO	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
Andy Zemba	PA DEP	azemba@state.pa.us
Ning Zhou	VA Tech/CBPO	nzhou@chesapeakebay.net
Sean Zhang	Carroll Engineering	seanxzhang@yahoo.com