Phase 6 Review Comments

Gary Shenk

CBPO

Partnership Feedback

- Email to Gary Shenk, Matt Johnston, and/or Lewis Linker
- Different types of feedback
  - Question
    - simple email or phone call
    - not tracked
  - Discussion
    - Series of emails or calls
    - Emails briefly summarized in posted document
  - Proposed Fatal Flaw
    - After discussion
    - Raised to CBP workgroup as proposed fatal flaw
    - Tracked and recorded

Fatal Flaw Review

- June and July – Partnership 'Fatal Flaw' Review

  - Criterion #1 – problem with the model
    - Failure to follow partnership instructions as of 12/31/2016
    - Omission of data received by 12/31/2016
    - Overall failure of calibration
    - Illogical results

  AND

  - Criterion #2 – Significant impairment in the ability to
    - Set planning targets
    - Assess progress

A Fatal Flaw is not

- A disagreement with a final decision that has been made by the partnership
- A disagreement with a scientific or technical method or product in favor of another method or product.
- A failure to match loads for particular monitoring station(s) or constituent(s)
- A disagreement with a planning target

33 Comments received

- 4 Big Categories
  - Land use (LUWG)
  - Inputs (WQGIT)
  - Simulation (MWG)
  - Simple Fixes

- 1st Fatal Flaw already determined by WQGT
  - VA crop and pasture land uses
  - Means that there will be a final calibration

Oops

- Shoreline loads all attributed to non-federal (VA)
  - Analysis happening now
  - Will be attributed to all agencies in the final
- Mixed Open sediment loads high (MD)
  - CBPO determined that the wrong C-factor was used
  - Will be fixed in final
- Problem with 1987 input loads found during the input review period – fixed in draft phase 6 (Fairfax Co)
- Used wrong biosolids file – WQGIT decided to make the change in CAST (MD)

Inputs

- Mixing crop removal vs crop uptake (MD)
  - AMS discussing
- Animal numbers and distribution (VA)
  - Spatial distribution of Ag Census during calibration
  - Permits versus projections for management runs
- High loads on certain small land uses (VA)
- Large variation in nutrient applications to turf (VA)
  - Request made to USWG to reconsider

Inputs

- Pasture stocking rates are high in some areas. Are state-supplied data on confinement being used (MD)
- Explain fixation values and effects (MD)
- Riparian pasture loads are higher than expected (MD)

BMPs

- Discussions of benefits of nutrient management, manure transport, and manure treatment technologies (MD and DE)
  - Partnership decision that future scenarios are set at the last available application rate unless nutrient management changes the rate.

Land Use

- VA crop and pasture land use uncertainty (VA)
- Declines in developed land uses in some years (VA)
- Impervious uncertainty should be decreased (MD)
- Too much turf in remote areas, should be mixed open (WV)

Soil P

- Soil P in scenarios – How to represent scenarios (everyone)
- Request for more information on soil P data (MD)
- Raise uncertainty of Berkeley County soil P data (WV)
- Instead of uniform P across all crops, split into manure and non-manure land use groups (VA)

Calibration

- Testing of other L2W factor configurations, specifically nitrogen without EVI (MD)
- Explain Calibration decisions (MD)
  - Attenuation in rivers (MD)
  - Targets – If crop inputs are lower in P6 why aren't outputs lower (MD)
  - Applying above RIM to below RIM (MD)

Sensitivities

- Explain how sensitivities adequately allow for reductions (MD)
- Explain uptake sensitivities (MD)

Stream delivery and delivery factors

- Delivery factors above 1 (MD)
  - In discussion
- Stream bank erosion and floodplain accumulation loads should not be equal and opposite (MD, CSN, CWP)
- SSR in developed areas (MD, CSN, CWP)