

# **CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM WATER QUALITY GOAL IMPLEMENTATION TEAM**

July 11, 2016 CONFERENCE CALL

## **Call Summary**

### Summary of Action and Decision Items:

ACTION: WQGIT members and interested parties should submit feedback on the objectives of the Phase III WIPs to James Davis-Martin ([james.davis-martin@deq.virginia.gov](mailto:james.davis-martin@deq.virginia.gov)) to be discussed during future WQGIT meetings. Questions or comments on the [Draft Preliminary Phase III WIP Expectations document](#), posted to the July 11 WQGIT meeting page, should be submitted to Lucinda Power ([power.lucinda@epa.gov](mailto:power.lucinda@epa.gov)).

### Phase III WIP Discussion –James Davis-Martin, Chair and Lucinda Power, EPA

James led a discussion on the objectives for the Phase III WIPs, asking the WQGIT membership to consider:

- Who is the target audience(s) for the Phase III WIPs?
- What are some key components of the Phase III WIPs?
- What do we hope to achieve with the Phase III WIPs?
- What are some of the prominent constraints, challenges and risks that could impact the effectiveness of the Phase III WIPs, and how might we address those challenges?

### **Discussion:**

- James raised the question of who the target audience is for the Phase III WIPs. Is EPA the primary target audience for the Phase III WIPs, or are the planning documents being developed serve as a state or local government tool?
  - Beth McGee: We see local governments as one of the main targets, and they should be very engaged in developing the Phase III WIPs. We think local engagement needs to be in the development of the Phase III WIPs, so that the locals are bought into the final Phase III WIPs.
  - Tanya Spano agreed with Beth, and stated that the Phase III WIPs need to have implementable, actionable items in addition to planning language.
  - Dave Montali noted that there may not be active, engaged localities in all areas of the watershed, and that it may be difficult for some jurisdictions to incorporate a high degree of local participation in the Phase III WIP development process.
  - Nicki Kasi questioned whether this discussion was better suited for the Local Area Targets Task Force.

- Norm Goulet disagreed with Tanya's point, stating that local governments are not a signatory to the Bay Program. If the Phase III WIP document went to localities, it would have to have been stated and required in an EPA mandate.
  - Lee Currey noted that if the target audience is the same as who is accountable under the Bay TMDL, the audience would be the jurisdictions and their state agencies. That target audience will be ultimately accountable in dealing with any consequences or back-stop actions.
  - Tanya Spano suggested that all Phase III WIPs could include an appendix that would detail how the local jurisdictions would be engaged.
- James Davis-Martin asked the WQGIT what everyone hopes to get out of the WIP planning process, and whether any other groups should be included in this process.
  - Nicki Kasi stated that the document should serve to identify who will do what, by when, what is needed to get there, and from there the document can serve as a strategic, consensus building tool, as well as an informational document for related groups.
  - Beth McGee agreed, and added that in order to achieve consensus, the related parties need to be involved early on in this process in order to get buy-in.
  - Bill Angstadt raised the question how agricultural groups will be incorporated into the Phase III WIP process. WQGIT members noted that they have been coordinating with state representatives and agricultural groups in order to tie them into the process.
- Group discussion of comments, concerns, or constraints on the development process.
  - Nicki Kasi noted that sharing the allocations, and clear, concise messaging will be two critical pieces to the Phase III WIP development process and implementation.
  - There was a suggestion from Nicki Kasi to define a process to lay out the expectations for a jurisdiction in the event that after their Phase III WIP is developed, they cannot reach their TMDL goals. It was recommended that this process be included in the Phase III WIP Expectations document.
- There was group discussion of how the Phase III WIP evaluations will take place. Besides state loads, should other spatial scales (basins, segments, sectors, and allocations) be examined on an individual basis?
- Questions from the group were raised on what the process, evaluations, and climate considerations will be like after 2025, and how that will factor into WIP development into the future.
- Bill Angstadt suggested that state jurisdictions should provide guidance on expectations for each individual sector.
  - Suzanne Trevena noted that EPA did not necessarily want to be overly-prescriptive in their expectations so that jurisdictions may tailor them to their specific needs.

- James Davis-Martin suggested the WQGIT continue to clarify and refine this Phase III WIP framework, and further discuss what the WQGIT and CBP Partnership want to achieve with the Phase III WIPs during upcoming meetings.
- Lucinda Power noted that the Management Board will be discussing the Draft Preliminary WIP Expectations document this Thursday, July 14.

ACTION: WQGIT members and interested parties should submit feedback on the objectives of the Phase III WIPs to James Davis-Martin ([james.davis-martin@deq.virginia.gov](mailto:james.davis-martin@deq.virginia.gov)) to be discussed during future WQGIT meetings. Questions or comments on the [Draft Preliminary Phase III WIP Expectations document](#), posted to the July 11 WQGIT meeting page, should be submitted to Lucinda Power ([power.lucinda@epa.gov](mailto:power.lucinda@epa.gov)).

### Phase 6.0 Land Use Update – Peter Claggett, USGS

Peter provided an update on the development of the Phase 6 land use data, including the schedule for the local land use review, and touched briefly on some of the differences between Virginia's land cover data and the data processed by the Chesapeake Conservancy and University of Vermont. More information is available in his [presentation](#) on the meeting page.

The CBP Land Data Team expect the final pieces of the land cover data, which is being developed by various contractors, to be delivered by the end of July. The CBP Land Data Team will begin processing the land use data on a rolling timeline, starting with Delaware (local review beginning July 25), and ending with Virginia. Peter noted the local review of the land use data will be restricted to making changes and edits to the local parcel data that was interpreted by the CBP Land Data Team. The team will not be making changes to the decision rules being used in the processing model that have been developed over the past year and vetted through the CBP source sector workgroups.

### **Discussion:**

- Question from Sarah Diebel on the difference between the CBP Land Data Team changing decision rules, and changing the interpretation of local parcel data.
  - Peter Claggett: Changing the interpretation of the data is done on a much smaller scale, on a by-county basis as opposed to changing the set of decision rules that were used to develop the models to create the land use data.
- Question on whether localities will have been able to review the land cover data prior to it being processed into the Phase 6 land use data set.
  - Peter Claggett: Yes. All counties outside of Virginia will have been reviewed by localities prior to its delivery to the CBP Land Data Team and converted into the Phase 6 land use data set.

- All land use data will be distributed for review by the localities by September 30<sup>th</sup>. The Phase 6 land use data set will then be completed and submitted to the Partnership's Modeling Workgroup by December 2<sup>nd</sup>.
  - James Davis-Martin suggested that the subdivisions of the data into regulated, federal, and non-federal be incorporated into the local review process. Peter Claggett responded that the CSOs, MS4s, and SSAs will be available for download on the CBP FTP website, and he will make sure the CBP Land Data Team highlight that as an available review opportunity.
- Question from Sarah Diebel about delivery dates for federal review and submittal of land use percentages, and when the online federal facilities editor review tool will be available. Peter directed questions to Andy Fitch ([afitch@chesapeakebay.net](mailto:afitch@chesapeakebay.net)) and Renee Thompson ([rthompso@chesapeakebay.net](mailto:rthompso@chesapeakebay.net)), who are coordinating the development of federal lands in the land use model.
- Concerns were raised by the WQGIT on the feasibility of the proposed timeline, particularly on the incorporation the pre-locally reviewed land use data into the Beta 4, October calibration of the model.

#### Success Stories – Walter Higgins, EPA

Walter discussed progress made in Wastewater Treatment Plant optimization by developing on/off aerators in order to more effectively remove nutrients from the waste water, and in turn save energy at the plants. Additional information can be found in Walter's [presentation](#) on the meeting page.

#### **Discussion:**

- Tanya Spano emphasized the importance of small-to-medium sized facilities, and how critical it is to get state and EPA support for those facilities. Tanya recommended that if jurisdictions feel strongly about getting EPA and federal support for small-to-medium facilities, they should coordinate with and relay those recommendations to their representative on the Partnership's Wastewater Treatment Workgroup.

#### Economic Benefits of a Cleaner Chesapeake Bay – Beth McGee, CBF

Beth provided an overview of the Bay Foundation's economics report that was recently published in the Journal of Coastal Management. This report includes an analysis which calculates the economic benefits of cleaning up the Chesapeake Bay, factoring in ecosystem services of the different Bay habitats. This [report](#) and the associated [published paper](#) are available to download freely through open access. If members have

any questions, they should contact Beth McGee ([bmcgee@cbf.org](mailto:bmcgee@cbf.org)). Additional information can be found in Beth's [presentation](#) on the meeting page.

**Discussion:**

- Tanya Spano asked when the workshop on optimization would take place. James noted that it could occur either in the fall or the spring, but it is still to be determined.

Atlantis Ecosystem Model – Tom Ihde, ERT

Tom provided an overview of the Chesapeake Atlantis Model (CAM), a decision support tool that simulates ecosystem dynamics under future, modified system conditions for climate, habitat, water chemistry and water quality. The tool is designed to test human impacts on the environment, and to provide information for decision makers on trade-offs of policy choices, in the context of multiple, simultaneous system stressors. Additional information can be found in Tom's [presentation](#) on the meeting page.

**Discussion:**

- James Davis-Martin expressed interest in learning how climate change, coupled with the TMDL efforts, would influence other species.
- Beth McGee asked why in the TMDL scenario, Atlantic menhaden decreased. Also asked if Tom was surprised that blue crab did not decrease significantly with the SAV loss, and whether nitrogen improved DO in the model, and if not, why not simulate an increase in DO?
  - Tom responded that a large portion of the menhaden population travel through the Bay, but that most of the effects that happen on the population occur outside of the Bay. What's being simulated is an increase in the natural mortality rate, which could be the result of changing predators. Regarding the SAV loss, there is SAV loss in every scenario, and can effectively 'wash out' results. He also stated that DO estimation is not typically used as an input in this type of model.
- Tanya Spano stated that this model is helpful in showing adaptive management, and would be useful for the Bay Program. She asked where more information was available.
  - Tom responded that in order for this model to be completed, it needed information from the Bay Program management strategies and outcomes. He also noted that the model will run out of funding in September, and as a result it is not available for public use at this time.
  - James Davis-Martin suggested the WQGIT provide a formal recommendation to continue funding for the tool for use in Bay Program efforts, and that this recommendation be advanced up to the Management Board, and potentially the PSC, in order to secure funding. Tanya Spano expressed agreement.

## Adjourned

## List of Call Participants

<b>Member Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
James Davis-Martin (Chair)	VA DEQ
Teresa Koon (Vice-Chair)	WV DEP
Lucinda Power (Coordinator)	EPA
Lindsey Gordon (Staff)	CRC
John Schneider	DE DNREC
George Onyullo	DOEE
Marty Hurd	DOEE
Dinorah Dalmasy	MDE
Lee Currey	MDE
Jim George	MDE
Alisha Mulkey	MDA
Rachel Rhodes	MDA
Bruce Michael	MD DNR
Nicki Kasi	PA DEP
Kristen Wolf	PA DEP
Ted Tesler	PA DEP
Dave Montali	WV DEP
Marel King	CBC
Ann Jennings	CBC
Suzanne Trevena	EPA, R3
Chris Day	EPA, R3
Ruth Izraeli	EPA, R3
Kelly Gable	EPA, R3
Bill Angstadt	Angstadt Consulting
Jenn Volk	U of Delaware
Sarah Diebel	DOD
Beth McGee	CBF
Norm Goulet	NVRC
Tanya Spano	MWCOG
Gary Shenk	USGS
Scott Phillips	USGS
Peter Claggett	USGS
Fred Irani	USGS
Zoe Johnson	NOAA
Mark Dubin	UMD
Caroline Donovan	UMCES
Jessica Blackburn	CAC

Joan Smedinghoff  
Angela Redwine  
Kevin McGonigal  
Marian Norris  
Karl Blankenship  
Lisa Ochsenhirt

CRC  
VDH  
Susquehanna River Basin Commission  
NPS  
Bay Journal  
V/MAMWA