

**CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM
WATER QUALITY GOAL IMPLEMENTATION TEAM
October 19th, 2009 Conference Call**

SUMMARY OF DECISIONS, ACTIONS, AND ISSUES

Review/Approve of Issues Addressed in Phase 5.3 WSM Calibration – Gary Shenk

DECISION: WQGIT approval of proposed issues to address in the Phase 5.3 Watershed Model Calibration.

Updates to the TMDL/WIP Schedule – Rich Batiuk, Katherine Antos

DECISION: WQGIT majority approval of TMDL schedule with NY dissenting and PA dissenting to a December 2010 deadline.

Updates to WQGIT Schedule – Rich Batiuk, Katherine Antos

ACTION: WQGIT members will respond to an availability poll for scheduling the next WQGIT face-to-face meeting.

DECISION: WQGIT majority approval of updated WQGIT schedule with NY dissenting and PA expressing concerns about sediment load implications.

Updates to Watershed Implementation Plan Guidance – Katherine Antos

MINUTES

Review/Approve of Issues Addressed in Phase 5.3 WSM Calibration – Gary Shenk

Gary Shenk reviewed the issues that Chesapeake Bay Program Partners requested to be resolved in the Phase 5.3 WSM model calibration ([Attachment A](#)).

Slide 3

- Mark Dubin soliciting data from states on practices to put into Scenario Builder
- Bill Keeling pointed out geographic error

Slide 4

- Think time points for urban land are 82, 90, 2002, 2006. Will check with Peter Claggett.
- Avoid double-counting for combined sewer (CS) land by having zero output load on CS land use; CS load will be based on data from individual systems; as CS area shrinks, we will reduce the land use area.
- Legacy sediments are involved in stream restoration BMP; sediment workgroup will consider this on 10/22; legacy sediments or stream scour is not a calibration issue, but issue of where we attribute the load, which is not meaningful for calibration; probably going to arrive at a method for attributing an amount to the stream bed.
- To quantify legacy sediments versus what is coming off from erosion: could get an outside estimate, let the model tell us how much it is scouring or look at the balance; will determine through sediment workgroup; must define legacy sediment.
- In the model there is not bed load or differentiation between bed and bank scour; BMPs will have to be aggregated to some level.
- New segmentation will be implemented for the 5.3 model.

DECISION: WQGIT approval of proposed issues to address in the Phase 5.3 Watershed Model Calibration.

Updates to the TMDL/WIP Schedule – Rich Batiuk, Katherine Antos

Rich Batiuk and Katherine Antos presented changes to the Bay TMDL schedule and detailed interim deadlines ([Attachments B1](#)).

Slide 5

- Changes recommending to PSC to address concerns about submission of WIP
- Staged approach
- March deadline pushed back to June
- Phasing WIP to promote local involvement
- Over 2011, break up WLA, LA by local target for draft by June 2011, final by November 2011 to inform next 2 year milestone for Jan 1st 2012. Also in updated WIP, want input deck through 2017 to be submitted in 2011

DECISION: WQGIT majority approval of TMDL schedule with NY dissenting and PA dissenting to a December 2010 deadline.

- Have a projection of the atmospheric deposition based on the trend in NADP wet deposition for the 2008 loads

Updates to WQGIT Schedule – Rich Batiuk, Katherine Antos

Rich Batiuk and Katherine Antos presented changes to the WQGIT schedule ([Attachment B2](#)).

- Bob Yowell expressed concern that we are first reviewing results of Sediment Transport Model on February 8th, when it will be locked down February 15th. Rich Batiuk explained

that EPA will put a hold on sediment to focus on nutrients, but the sediment work group is now working on this again.

ACTION: WQGIT members will respond to an availability poll for scheduling the next WQGIT face-to-face meeting.

- States asked about shifting loads between basins, so we will be asking you to submit changes you might want for WIP development at the end of February to run through the model. We would have those results in March. There was also the list of reasons the loads could shift. We will have more detailed targets at the PSC meeting. We have time set aside later for a more rigorous model run. By end of calendar year we will be working on tools for calculating load shift between N and P and between basins without a full WIP.
- We will assume average implementation rates within a state, but if you want to refine/target placement we can do that and it will improve accuracy.

DECISION: WQGIT majority approval of updated WQGIT schedule with NY dissenting to a monthly call commitment and PA expressing concerns about sediment load implications.

Updates to Watershed Implementation Plan Guidelines – Katherine Antos

Katherine Antos presented updates to the WIP guidelines that will be shared with the PSC.

- Changes since WQGIT call 10/9 are underlined and in red font

Slide 5

- 2011 WIP (Phase II): want input deck with controls put on the ground to meet 2017 interim target
- Detail for WIP due in 2010 (Phase I) should include loads by drainage areas and which WWTP would have upgrades for 2017; key actions or program building planned; not asking for acreage of BMPs, that would be for 2011
- Can run input deck for Phase I if states want
- Want loads by segment, just not specific controls.
- Breakdown sectors by onsite, WWTP (significant and non-significant), agriculture (CAFO and non-CAFO), stormwater (MS4 and non-MS4), atmospheric deposition, and forest
- Will establish gross LA and WLA for non-tidal states including all the sources on the condition that you can give us a finer level of detail in the implementation plans.
- Pennsylvania objected to the number of sectors, unless sector load reduction could be zero or negative.

PARTICIPANTS

Dave Hansen, Chair	U. of Delaware	djhansen@udel.edu
Bob Koroncai, Chair	EPA R3	Koroncai.robert@epa.gov
Katherine Antos, Coordinator	EPA CBPO	antos.katherine@epa.gov
Rich Batiuk	EPA/CBPO	batiuk.richard@epa.gov
Karl Blankenship	Bay Journal	bayjournal@earthlink.net
Bill Brannon	WV DEP	william.d.brannon@wv.gov
Pat Buckley	PA DEP	pbuckley@state.pa.us
Arthur Butt	VA DEQ	ajbutt@deq.virginia.gov
Monir Chowdhury	DDOE	monir.chowdhury@dc.gov
Lee Currey	MDE	lcurrey@mde.state.md.us
James Davis-Martin	VA DCR	james.davis-martin@dcr.virginia.gov
Chris Day	EPA R3	day.christopher@epa.gov
Ron Entringer	NY DEC	raentrin@gw.dec.state.ny.us
Rich Eskin	MDE	reskin@mde.state.md.us
Norm Goulet	NVRC	ngoulet@novaregion.org
Steve Hann	HRMM&L	shann@hrmml.com
Dave Heicher	SRBC	dheicher@srbc.net
Ruth Izraeli	EPA R2	izraeli.ruth@epa.gov
Bill Keeling	VA DCR	william.keeling@dcr.virginia.gov
John Kennedy	VA DEQ	jmkennedy@deq.virginia.gov
Teresa Koon	WV DEP	teresa.m.koon@wv.gov
Sara Lane	MD DNR	slane@dnr.state.md.us
Felix Locicero	EPA R2	locicero.felix@epa.gov
Charles Martin	VA DEQ	chmartin@deq.virginia.gov
Beth McGee	CBF	bmcgee@cbf.org
Bruce Michael	MD DNR	bmichael@dnr.state.md.us
Matt Mullin	CBC	mmullin@chesbay.us
Lisa Ochsenhirt	AquaLaw	lisa@aqualaw.com
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
Marel Raub	CBC	mraub@chesbay.us
John Schneider	DE DNREC	john.schneider@state.de.us
Gary Shenk	EPA/CBPO	gshenk@chesapeakebay.net
Mohsin Siddique	DC WASA	mohsin_siddique@dcwasa.com
Rachel Streusand	CRC/CBP	rstreusa@chesapeakebay.net
Nita Sylvester	EPA/CBPO	sylvester.nita@epa.gov
Sara Walker	WRI	swalker@wri.org
Bob Yowell	PA DEP	ryowell@state.pa.us