

Water Quality Goal Implementation Team (WQGIT)

Monday, October 27th, 2025 1:00 - 3:00 PM

Visit the meeting webpage for meeting materials and additional information.

Purpose: This is the monthly meeting of the Water Quality Goal Implementation Team (WQGIT). Members heard updates on long-term planning, discussed the Urban Nutrient Management Expert Panel's recommendations and shared feedback on the initial proposed structure for the Bay Program.

Minutes

I. Welcome and Announcements

Lead: Greg Sandi, WQGIT Vice-Chair

II. Business & Workgroup Updates

Lead: Petra Baldwin, WQGIT Co-Staffer and Jeremy Hanson, WQGIT Coordinator

Petra gave an overview of various announcements and updates. She noted recent and upcoming MB and PSC meetings and reminded members that the EC meeting is set for Dec 2 at the National Aquarium in Baltimore, MD. Petra shared major updates from recent workgroup meeting and progress of Phase 7 model input decisions. More detailed updates from workgroups are outlined on the <u>posted slides</u>. Other announcements and upcoming opportunities are linked in the <u>agenda</u>.

Materials: Presentation, Jul – Sep 2025 Phase 7 Decision Planner (version date: 10.23.25), Oct 2025 – Feb 2026 Phase 7 Decision Planner (version date: 10.23.25)

III. Longer-Term Planning and Scheduling

Lead: Jeremy Hanson, WQGIT Coordinator

Jeremy gave an overview of the revised Reducing Excess Nitrogen, Phosphorus and Sediment Outcome and targets as approved by the MB at their Oct 9th meeting. Jeremy walked through major components and high-level steps to work towards the 2040 Watershed Agreement time horizon. Jeremy noted that the current Phase 7 timeline has not yet been impacted by the lapse in appropriations as work is continuing where it can. For the next few months, WQGIT will be focusing on Phase 7 inputs and processing methods, building foundations for future in-depth conversations about settings targets and tiered implementation, discussions on 2025 Progress release and messaging.

Materials: Presentation

Actions:

- 1. WQGIT leadership will add a discussion of communication and messaging of 2025 Progress to an upcoming WQGIT meeting agenda.
- 2. WQGIT leadership will continue developing more detailed timelines and graphics for the Phase 7 model development and new target setting under Target #2 of the new RENPS Outcome.
- 3. If you have any priorities or questions for the WQGIT to focus on in upcoming meetings, please reach out to WQGIT leadership.

Discussion:

- James Martin, VA DCR requested WQGIT begin conversations on the process for setting targets during 2027 while the model is being reviewed, so that targets can be set swiftly in 2028.
- Greg Sandi, MDE noted the importance of 2025 Progress and suggested WQGIT discuss how jurisdictions can coordinate strategies for messaging across the partnership. James Martin agreed and added desire to discuss how to communicate progress under changing conditions in the model and explore other tools to showcase the effectiveness of work occuring in the partnership. Greg added that Maryland has worked with local jurisdictions to highlight successes at the local level.
- KC Filippino, HRPDC asked for an update on the expected timeline for 2025 Progress release given the current lapse in funding. Bo Williams, EPA responded that it is still set for a May-June 2026 release, with no impact to the timeline yet, however recognizing there are components that could be impacted including EPA staff processing and NRCS data sharing.
- James Martin, VA DCR asked where decisions on tiered targets would likely be made in CBP. Jeremy and Greg responded speculatively that it may occur at a higher-level of the partnership given the cross-partnership aspects including living resources, but it is unclear until the final structure changes get settled.

IV. UNM Expert Panel Recommendations

Lead: David Wood, CSN, USWG Coordinator

David gave an overview of the recommendations from the Urban Nutrient Management (UNM) Panel Report, noting these are consensus recommendations pending one official vote from a federal panel member. David shared background on the original 2013 Panel Report, the charge for this panel, an overview of the literature review findings, details on the three suggested BMPs, record keeping guidance, and tweaks to the fertilizer application rate methodology. The three BMP recommendations are an UNM Plan with a soil test, an UNM Plan without a soil test, and non-fertilized turfgrass acres.

Materials: Presentation, UNM Panel Report, USWG Presentation Recording

Actions:

1. Please review the UNM Panel Report and supporting materials. If you have any further questions or comments on the UNM Panel Report recommendations, please email David Wood (david@chesapeakestormwater.org). WQGIT voting members will be asked to approve the report recommendations in November.

Discussion:

- KC Filippino, HRPDC requested that these BMPs be added to Phase 6 CAST as "planning BMPs" for jurisdictions to use in planning scenarios while Phase 7 is still being developed. David responded that Jess Rigelman, CBPO indicated this would be possible if the partnership is interested, so it can be done.
- James Martin, VA DCR commented that the panel seemed to focus on turf as opposed to the variety of herbaceous land outside agricultural areas that are considered urban pervious in the model. David responded that much of the literature and research has been done specifically on turfgrass, so there is a general focus there, but there was a lot of discussion by the panel on non-fertilizer BMPs and larger parks and municipallymanaged areas. David added that the panel originally discusses a land use for nonfertilized turfgrass, but there was no way to map it spatially.
- James noted that the reduction rate for the Non-fertilized Turfgrass BMP is lower than he would expect. David responded that part of the challenge is these areas are naturally very retentive to nutrients, so they don't respond much to changes in inputs.
- Marel King, CBC asked how sales data would be incorporated going forward. David responded no change was recommended by the panel – state fertilizer sales data would still be used as the basis for application rates.
- Marel King, CBC asked how strict the requirements for the UNM Plan BMPs would be, specifically on application timing given differences to legislation across jurisdictions.
 David responded that there is some flexibility, though he will look into the exact timing constraints around dormancy periods. The intent is not to need a legislation change to accommodate it.

V. Break

VI. CBP Structure Discussion

Leads: Jeremy Hanson, WQGIT Coordinator and Greg Sandi, WQGIT Vice-Chair Jeremy shared background on the recent and expected timeline of discussions on the revised CBP Structure at the MB and PSC. A decision on the structure for the Goal Team-level and above is expected at the Nov 6th PSC meeting. Jeremy noted many initial reactions were on desire for sector workgroups and at-large membership to continue. Greg and Jeremy led a discussion focused on the Clean Water Goal and its three outcomes as they stand, to elicit feedback and comments from WQGIT members. KC Filippino shared a structure chart that she and Norm Goulet developed to focus on some of the structure questions underneath the Clean Water Goal Team. There was robust discussion among the WQGIT.

Materials: <u>Discussion Slides</u> (including various strawman org charts), <u>Consolidated GIT and Workgroup Feedback Memo on CBP Structure</u>

Actions:

1. WQGIT will continue conversations about structure of the Clean Water Goal Team level and below at subsequent meetings.

Discussion:

• KC Filippino, HRPDC highlighted key parts of the structure chart she and Norm developed, including focusing only TMDL-related work under the Clean Water team,

- reframing how STAR is involved across the partnership, and streamlining without losing important groups under Clean Water.
- Norm Goulet, NVRC added consideration of moving the Modeling Workgroup under the Clean Water Goal Team, noted the importance of determining what will happen to some of the current Action Teams, and reiterated a desire to integrate science/STAR across all levels of the partnership.
- Dave Montali, Tetra Tech shared support for some ideas KC and Norm outlined, especially the importance of keeping sector workgroups while balancing how to cut or combine throughout to respond to jurisdictions' issue of too many groups to attend. Dave noted concern about the structuring of a Modeling Workgroup with hierarchy over other groups.
- Norm explained the Land Use/Land Cover Data Action Team is the continuation of the current LUWG's role in supporting technical assessments for the model on an ad-hoc basis, since the LUWG is transitioning to the Healthy Landscapes Goal for land use decision support.
- Kevin Mclean, VA DEQ shared that there plans to be significant time in 2026 to discuss and develop details for the structure, so the PSC's upcoming meeting decisions are higher-level. Kevin also noted the EC charge of streamlining means determining ways to reduce time and commitment required to cover CBP meeting, not necessarily reduce the number of workgroups. Kevin asked about the next steps or path forward from conversations today.
- Jeremy shared the goal was to begin conversations to be a step ahead in understanding what we want to see for the Goal Team moving forwarding, depending on what directives are received from top down. Norm added the structure chart they developed was just to spark discussion.
- Greg Sandi, MDE shared the need to consider streamlining beyond structure to ensure decisions are made at the right level and think of other ways to reduce meeting time like info sharing via short recording presentation or email.
- Marel King, CBC pointed out a key question to consider is the placement of Toxic Contaminants Workgroup.
- James Martin, VA DCR noted the need for thinking about adaptive management, SRS, cross-Goal Team coordination, etc. which fits in the integration box. He also noted the Clean Water Goal team will need to be responsible for the breadth of work under all three Outcomes, not just RENPS.
- KC asked if anyone from EPA could speak to their proposed revised strawman. Lee
 McDonnell, EPA notes it would likely be taken down and not discussed at the PSC
 meeting tomorrow.

VII. Wrap-Up

Lead: Petra Baldwin, WQGIT Co-Staffer

VIII. Adjourn

Next Meeting: Monday, November 17th, 2025

Attendance

Greg Sandi, MDE (WQGIT Vice-Chair) Jeremy Hanson, CRC (WQGIT Coordinator) Petra Baldwin, CRC (WQGIT Co-Staffer)

Anne Coates, TJSWCD Kristin Saunders, MD DNR Patrick Thompson, Energyworks Mike LaSala, LandStudies Scott Heidel, PADEP Dave Montali, TetraTech Tyler Trostle, PADEP Terra Famuliner, RVARC Lee McDonnell, EPA

Bo Williams, EPA

Maggie Woodward, CBC

Elizabeth Hoffman, MDA

Emily Dekar, Tioga Co., NY James Martin, VA DCR Kevin Mclean, VA DEQ Christina Lyerly, MDE David Wood, CSN Adrienne Kotula, CBC Lisa Ochsenhirt, AquaLaw Sushanth Gupta, MCWOG John Lancaster, PADEP
Eugenia Hart, TetraTech
Cassie Davis, NYS DEC
Marel King, CBC
Jess Blackburn, ACB
Norm Goulet, NVRC
Jessica Shippen, TJSWCD
Smantha Cotton, DNREC
George Onyullo, DC DOEE

Sabine Miller, MDE Caitlin Bolton, MWCOG Ashley Hullinger, PADEP KC Filippino, HRPDC Dylan Burgevin, MDE

Anne Hairston-Strang, MD DNR

Allison Welch, CRC Kelly Gable, EPA Marisa Baldine, ACB Holly Walker, DNREC Lucinda Power, EPA Arianna Johns, VA DEQ Joseph Wood, CBF

Acronyms

BMP: Best Management Practice

CAST: Chesapeake Assessment Scenario Tool

CBP: Chesapeake Bay Program

CRC: Chesapeake Research Consortium

EC: Executive Council

EPA: Environmental Protection Agency

LUWG: <u>Land Use Workgroup</u> MB: Management Board

NRCS: Natural Resources Conservation Service

PSC: Principals' Staff Committee

RENPS: Reducing Excess Nitrogen, Phosphorus and

Sediment

SRS: Strategy Review System

STAR: Scientific, Technical Assessment and

Reporting

TMDL: Total Maximum Daily Load UNM: Urban Nutrient Management USWG: Urban Stormwater Workgroup

WQGIT: Water Quality Goal Implementation Team

WTWG: Watershed Technical Workgroup