

**CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM
WATER QUALITY GOAL IMPLEMENTATION TEAM
September 14th, 2009 Conference Call**

SUMMARY OF DECISIONS, ACTIONS, AND ISSUES

Review of Watershed Model Phase 5.2 Model Scenarios – Gary Shenk

ACTION: Tanya Spano and Gary Shenk will collaborate to evaluate the consideration of septic as a component of wastewater and report back to WQGIT.

ACTION: Kenn Pattison will get feedback on the Phase 5.2 Scenarios from Dana Ongst.

ACTION: Gary Shenk follow-up with Ning Zhou to determine why the design flow is less than the current flow for some states.

ACTION: Prior to the face-to-face meeting, CBPO will:

- Rerun 1985 and 2002 E3 Scenarios to give a better grasp on the base year assumption
- Look into point sources and try to understand why there are different trends in E3 and No Action
- Run 2008, Tributary Strategy (TS) and Enhanced Programmatic scenario to help understand where we are now, where we expect to get to under current plans and where we could get under enhanced programmatic controls

Review of the September 29-30 WQGIT Meeting Agenda – Rich Batiuk

ACTION: CBPO will follow up with Bob Yowell on the equity of NPS in E3 individually and share the discussion with the rest of the WQGIT members.

ACTION: Rich Batiuk will follow up with Jon Capacasa to determine what the PSC wants to see for the Watershed Implementation Plans.

ACTION: CBPO will make the discussed changes to the agenda and repost the September 29th, 30th face-to-face meeting agenda.

ACTION: WQGIT members should inform Gary Shenk of any additional materials or analyses you would like to see at the face-to-face meeting September 29th, 30th.

MINUTES

Review of Watershed Model Phase 5.2 Model Scenarios – Gary Shenk

Slide 2

- First reproducible data set.
- Nutrient team spending most of its time on fixing bugs.

Slide 3

- https://archive.chesapeakebay.net/modeling/phase5/scenario_output/p52An/
- Email Gary Shenk (shenk.gary@epa.gov) for specific files desired.

Slide 4

- Waiting for WQGIT approval to run Enhanced Programmatic Implementation Level Scenario.

Slide 5

- Relative change between 85 and 2007 is close to the same between phase 4.3 and 5.2
 - BMP sensitivity has been reduced
 - Sensitivity to input data has been enhanced
 - Yearly atmospheric deposition also enhances sensitivity

Slide 6

- Also similar 4.3 to 5.2

Slide 7

- Decreased sensitivity to TSS from 4.3 to 5.2
- Atmospheric deposition did not push as far as some state partners have asked. There are more options in ammonia, etc. We will be continuing meeting to try to push further in the air sector prior to the PSC meeting in October. Please comment as you see fit on 202(a) portion. Will lay out more options at the 9/21 conference calls, more opportunities in tidal areas and open ocean.
- Tanya Spano stated that scenarios should also present state and local options for air reductions. If you can present it, states can see if they want to pursue it.

Slide 10

- Response between states is not consistent.

Slide 13

- Based on flat line allocation scenario
- 2002, 1985 has different set of assumptions than 2010
- Can't compare the difference moving to 2010 has directly. Will explain at face-to-face

Discussion:

- Total loads from point and nonpoint source from the state. The flat allocation line would be, for example, everybody does 90% of E3.
- Design flow is what is in NPDES permit
- Tanya Spano suggested for the group's consideration that there should be an evaluation of septic. Wastewater loads need to be evaluated as a whole, looking at them separately misses the overall management and effects of growth. It's important to look at point source effluent loads, but looking at overall load contribution for wastewater. People are people, it doesn't matter what they are hooked up to. If we tighten down on wastewater treatment plants too much we need to consider where that waste goes.

ACTION: Tanya Spano and Gary Shenk will collaborate to evaluate the consideration of septic as a component of wastewater and report back to WQGIT.

ACTION: Kenn Pattison will get feedback on the Phase 5.2 Scenarios from Dana Ongst.

ACTION: Gary Shenk follow-up with Ning Zhou to determine why the design flow is less than the current flow for some states and follow up the next WQGIT meeting.

ACTION: Prior to the face-to-face meeting, CBPO will:

- Rerun 1985 and 2002 E3 Scenarios to give a better grasp on the base year assumption
- Look into point sources and try to understand why there are different trends in E3 and No Action
- Run 2008, Tributary Strategy (TS) and Enhanced Programmatic scenario to help understand where we are now, where we expect to get to under current plans and where we could get under enhanced programmatic controls

Review of the September 29-30 WQGIT Meeting Agenda – Rich Batiuk

September 21st Conference Call

- Base year
- Feedback from allocation methodology options survey
- Enhanced Programmatic Implementation Scenario definitions
- Atmospheric deposition

September 29th, 30th Face-to-Face Meeting Agenda

- Does the flow make sense? What info should be delivered that we don't have on there? Are we asking the right questions?
- Alan Pollock finds that on the critical period item, we need to look at it from the point of view of a policy perspective, what is an acceptable return period to have the Bay not meeting standards when the flows are higher. Need to go through the statistical and hydrological analysis, but when it comes down to it we have to be able to clearly explain when we clean up the Bay what it means. The way the Bay standards are assessed is completely unique, so we cannot base it entirely off what states have done in the past as was looked at in the presentation last week. Rich Batiuk responded that we've got some clear decisions and request for actions, but we do need to be sure that as we head into the PSC that we have a critical period we can defend and that we have the analyses you requested at the last meeting.

ACTION: CBPO will follow up with Bob Yowell on the equity of NPS in E3 individually and share the discussion with the rest of the WQGIT members.

- Decisions can still be made without 5.3 numbers, despite 5.3's impact on allocation process, because it will have an effect in that the loads and sensitivity would change, but the decisions such as base year and design or current flow and maximum implementation level would remain the same in terms of the overall effect. We would change the numbers but not the method. Still have to put in final decimal points, but it shouldn't change the sense of the decisions we are making.
- Rich Eskin states that we should consider allocations to filter feeders and oysters, etc. Lewis Linker explained that this could adjust the target load. They will be integrated into the Water Quality Sediment Transport Model.

ACTION: Rich Batiuk will follow up with Jon Capacasa to determine what the PSC wants to see for the Watershed Implementation Plans.

- EPA will issue guidance on the phased TMDL and how that affected reasonable assurance by the upcoming discussion of this on September 29th.

ACTION: CBPO will make the discussed changes to the agenda and repost the September 29th, 30th face-to-face meeting agenda.

ACTION: WQGIT members should inform Gary Shenk of any additional materials or analyses you would like to see at the face-to-face meeting September 29th, 30th.

PARTICIPANTS

Katherine Antos, Coordinator	EPA CBPO	anton.katherine@epa.gov
Rich Batiuk	EPA/CBPO	batiuk.richard@epa.gov
Clifton Bell	Malcolm Pirnie	cbell@pirnie.com
Steve Bieber	MWCOG	sieber@mwco.org
Karl Blankenship	Bay Journal	bayjournal@earthlink.net
Lee Currey	MDE	lcurrey@mde.state.md.us
Norm Goulet	NVRC	ngoulet@novaregion.org
Steve Hann	HRMM&L	shann@hrmml.com
Will Hunley	HRSD	whunley@hrsd.com
Ruth Izraeli	EPA R2	izraeli.ruth@epa.gov
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
Bruce Michael	MD DNR	bmichael@dnr.state.md.us
Kenn Pattison	PA DEP	kpattison@state.pa.us
Russ Perkinson	VA DCR	russ.perkinson@dcr.virginia.gov
Jim Pletl	HRSD	jpletl@hrsd.dst.va.us
Alan Pollock	VA DEQ	aepollock@deq.virginia.gov
Ed Reilly	NY DEC	exreilly@gw.dec.state.ny.us
Gary Shenk	EPA/CBPO	gshenk@chesapeakebay.net
Mohsin Siddique	DC WASA	mohsin_siddique@dcwasa.com
Tanya Spano	MWCOG	tspano@mwco.org
Rachel Streusand	CRC/CBP	rstreusa@chesapeakebay.net
Jeff Sweeney	UMCES/CBPO	jsweeney@chesapeakebay.net
Sara Walker	WRI	swalker@wri.org
Sara Weammert	MD DNR	slane@dnr.state.md.us
Bob Yowell	PA DEP	ryowell@state.pa.us