Summary of Action and Decision Items

ACTION: The NACO resolution on localized pollution targets will be distributed to the Task Force.

ACTION: The Task Force will invite members of the CBP's Modeling Workgroup to their next meeting to get a better sense of the level of confidence in the decision support tools at the Task Force's defined local scales.

DECISION: The Task Force endorsed all recommended changes to the straw man decisions document.

ACTION: The recommended edits will be incorporated into the draft straw man decisions document, and it will be recirculated to the Task Force for final approval at the next meeting.

ACTION: The next Task Force call will be scheduled for August 30th, and David will send poll to schedule a second meeting in early September.

Welcome and Announcements – Lucinda Power, Coordinator

- The National Association of Counties (NACO) passed a resolution on localized targets at their annual meeting. The EPA Region III Regional Administrator is meeting with members of the Chesapeake Bay Program's Local Government Advisory Committee (LGAC) to discuss the resolution and other comments on the preliminary draft Phase III WIP expectations. LGAC had no involvement as a committee in the adoption of the resolution, but are helping to address it with the Regional Administrator.
- Task Force members requested a copy of the NACO resolution.

ACTION: The NACO resolution on localized pollution targets will be distributed to the Task Force.

- Joan Salvati (Co-Chair) reviewed the proposed schedule for the Task Force and emphasized that draft recommendations should be delivered to the Water Quality Goal Implementation Team (WQGIT) in September 2016. The WQGIT is holding a face-to-face meeting on October 24th-25th at which the Task Force chairs will be presenting the preliminary recommendations.

Discussion of Straw Man Document – Joan Salvati and Lisa Schaefer, Co-Chairs
Joan and Lisa walked the Task Force through a straw man document, designed to clarify the questions that will need to be addressed by the Task Force's recommendations (*Attach. A*).

- The Co-Chairs would like to focus the next two meetings on the straw man decisions document, in order to begin addressing the questions posed in the charge to the Task Force. The straw man decisions document will form the basis of the recommendations to the WQGIT.
    - o No objections or comments were raised with regard to the schedule, or the concept of the straw man document forming the basis of the Task Force's draft recommendations to the WQGIT.

- Joan and Lisa walked through each subheading in the straw man document, requesting comments and feedback.

What is meant by a target?
- No comments or edits proposed.

Q1. How should "local" be defined?
- Task Force recommended the addition of a #8 to make it clear that a jurisdiction might work with a combination of the suggestions reflected in #1-7.
- Task Force recommended the addition of "utility districts" in parenthetical of #3 to capture MS4s, SSO, and drinking water districts.

Q2. Should the Phase III WIPs include local area planning targets (LAPTs)?
- The Co-Chairs recommended that the Task Force defer the decision on this question until the rest of the document has been worked through. They asked for comments on the factors that need to be considered when answering that question.
- Recommendation to include consideration of whether there are feasible methods for evaluating progress towards achieving any targets that are established. It could be included by elaborating on the first bullet to address establishing targets as well as measuring progress.
- We may also want to address how often progress will be evaluated. Some kind of schedule or timing component could be built in as a consideration.
  - Progress is currently evaluated annually, and states develop milestones every 2 years. At the end of the milestone cycle, we also evaluate progress towards achieving the milestone. The CBP has a detailed reporting schedule that is already established.
  - There may also be ways of tracking progress against a target that doesn't involve the CBP suite of modeling tools. Tracking monitoring data or BMP implementation data may be other alternatives.
- Do CBP and states have the staff capacity to support providing evaluations and feedback at a more local scale? There are only so many people running the Partnership's modeling tools, and that could be a limiting factor if that is one of the evaluation tools. Who will be responsive to localities' requests for model runs? Overall capacity needs to be considered.
- Recommendation to include additional language in the 3rd bullet to clarify that it is intended to provide flexibility for whether or not targets are established for all sectors or geographies within a state.
- Recommendation to add language to the second bullet to say whether it would allow jurisdictions to focus limited resources to critical areas for implementation.
- For the first bullet, we all need to think about what the level of confidence is, particularly from the local governments, in the accuracy of the support tools at the finer scales. If there isn't a lot of confidence, how would we go about ensuring that there is a greater comfort level in the tools we'd be using moving forward?
  - It depends on the definition of the local scale. The confidence in the suite of tools is a Partnership decision, as is the scale at which we want to use the tools for local targets.
- Lisa: Can we get a reaction from the modelers now that we've progressed further towards defining local, to get their reaction on the confidence levels?

ACTION: The Task Force will invite members of the CBP's Modeling Workgroup to their next meeting to get a better sense of the level of confidence in the decision support tools at the Task Force's defined local scales.

- The WQGIT Chair asked the Task Force to consider defining what would be considered sufficient enough accuracy from the Partnership's modeling tools. Task Force recommendations could be framed such that "if the Model is accurate to __ scale, the Task Force would recommend that targets look like ___. If not, the Task Force recommends targets be expressed by ___".
  - Local government officials stated that the accuracy of the Partnership's modeling tools need to align with the requirements being implemented. Local governments need to be able to implement the requirements with staff and resources, and if we can't verify or track progress, those requirements do us no good. At the end of the day, we answer to our constituents, and having data at a sub-county scale without assurance or accuracy is not good enough.

- The Partnership has never been able to get confidence interval data from its modeling tools. It is unlikely we will get that information on multiple scales.
- Recommendation to add a consideration of who would set the targets and whether or not they have the legal authority, and technical capacity to do it.
  - The states should work with the locality to make sure the targets are reasonable and achievable within the scope and realm of available resources.
- How do the wasteload allocations (WLAs) fit into the establishment of local area targets? Do we operate under the understanding that these will be entirely separate from the WLAs, or are they interwoven?
  - There is no way we want to start establishing WLAs for local areas. There are allocations at the state level, period. If the states want to work with locals to develop something on a local scale, fine, but we should not be addressing local WLAs.
  - EPA does not want to create local WLAs. Thinking about local area targets, WLAs should be considered as part of the load from the county, but EPA does not envision that there would be WLAs established at a more local scale than what was established in the Bay TMDL.
  - Last time we set WLAs we had different land uses and our counties told us that in some cases they were not correct. I think they would expect us to update those WLAs now that we have better information. Is there an opportunity to convey that through the Phase III WIPs to EPA?
    - Yes, that is part of the purpose of the Phase III WIPs. If there are needed course corrections, that is the time to do it.
  - In this document, we are trying to create flexibility. If Maryland wanted to build on their Phase II WIP efforts and work local targets into their WLAs, that is their choice.

Q3: How should LAPTs be expressed?
- Recommendation to add percent reduction of existing load.
- Recommendation to add a percent reduction in flow through certain tributaries.
  - To use flow as a measure of progress, you would also need to be sure that concentrations remains constant.
  - West Virginia's developed land in the WIP must capture 1-inch rainfall for developed acres. You could, in theory, figure out where those 1-inch storms are happening and match it up at the monitoring stations for flow to see the effectiveness of those flow-reduction-based BMPs.
- Are there any options that should be crossed off the list?
  - Agreement that all options should remain.
- Recommendation to add an introductory paragraph to clarify that targets could be expressed using any one of these options or in some combination.
- Recommendation to use the language "quantifying implementation goals" for bullet 2 because some BMPs are measured by acres, some by units, some by linear ft, etc.

Q4: What are recommended options for targets including scale?
- Recommendation to remove question 4 entirely. Having these specific examples might limit us.
  - A better use of the Task Force's time might be to limit the combinations of bullets to see if any would not be feasible.
- Any objections to removing Question 4?
  - No objections were raised.

DECISION: The Task Force endorsed all recommended changes to the straw man decisions document.

ACTION: The recommended edits will be incorporated into the draft straw man decisions document, and it will be recirculated to the Task Force for final approval at the next meeting.

Wrap-up and Next Steps – Lucinda Power and David Wood, Coordinators
Lucinda and David reviewed points of agreement, action items, and questions that need to be resolved by the next conference call. A summary of the call will be distributed to the membership and posted to the Task Force's CBP calendar page.

ACTION: The next Task Force call will be scheduled for August 30th, and David will send poll to schedule a second meeting in early September.

Adjourned

Next conference call: August 30th, 1-3pm

Meeting Participants

Member Name	Affiliation	
Lucinda Power	Staff	EPA, CBPO
David Wood	Staff	CRC, CBPO
Jennifer Walls	DE- State	DNREC
Sarah Diebel	Federal	DOD
Adam Wright	Federal	DOD
Jen Sincock	Federal	EPA
Suzanne Trevena	Federal	EPA
Jeff Sweeney	Federal	EPA
Mary Gattis	Local	LGAC
Jessica Blackburn	Local	CAC
Bruce Williams	MD- Local	LGAC-Maryland
Vimal Ameen	MD- State	MDE
Jim George	MD- State	MDE
Ben Sears	NY- State	NYSDEC
Lisa Schaefer	PA- Local	County Commissioners Assoc. of PA
Brenda Shambaugh	PA- Local	PACD
Nicki Kasi	PA- State	PA DEP
Ted Tesler	PA- State	PA DEP
Kristen Wolf	PA- State	PA DEP
Ann Jennings	Regional	CBC
Chris Pomeroy	VA- Local	VAMSA/VAMWA
Norm Goulet	VA- Local	NVRC
Joe Wood	VA- Local	CBF
Christopher Thomas	VA- Local	King George Co. Service Authority
Ruby Brabo	VA- Local	King George County
Scott Rae	VA- Local	Gloucester County
Debbie Byrd	VA- Local	Goochland County
Katie Frazier	VA- Local	VA Agribusiness Council
Whitney Katchmark	VA- Local	HRPDC
Joan Salvati	VA- State	VA DEQ
James Davis-Martin	VA-State/ WQGIT	VA DEQ
Matthew Pennington	WV- Local	Eastern Panhandle Planning council
Alana Hartman	WV- State	WV DEP