

CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM
WATER QUALITY GOAL IMPLEMENTATION TEAM
August 24, 2015 CONFERENCE CALL
Meeting Minutes

Summary of Action and Decision Items

ACTION: David Wood will send out an email to the WQGIT with the process and schedule for nominating at-large members.

ACTION: WQGIT members should send preferences for priority FY15 GIT Funding Proposals to Lucinda (Power.Lucinda@epa.gov) and James (James.Davis-Martin@deq.virginia.gov) as soon as possible.

ACTION: The proposed Wetlands Land Uses will be brought to the WQGIT for a decision during the September 14 meeting.

Welcome/Confirm Call Participants/Workgroup Updates – Jenn Volk, Chair

GIT Funding Proposals – James Davis-Martin, Vice-Chair

- James Davis-Martin (Vice-Chair, VA DEQ): Funding is available for projects that support the Management Strategies. There is something in the ballpark of \$140,000 per goal team, but we should collect and evaluate all of the proposals to determine priorities. The practices selected will be considered by GIT chairs on September 1. There may be a call to further refine those proposals if needed after the evaluations, and September 8 is the final deadline for the proposals.

Discussion:

- Davis-Martin: My proposal was for identifying ancillary and unintended benefits of BMPs and building an optimization tool that could be used to help with WIP development. The idea is to be able to factor in the ancillary benefits these BMPs may have and how they may help achieve other non-water quality management strategy outcomes.
 - Dianne McNally (EPA R3): The optimization tool would be like a qualitative metric to help planners decide which BMPs best suit the goals of their locality?
 - Davis-Martin: It is a qualitative approach to understanding impacts of BMPs on management strategies beyond just the water quality management strategy.
 - Dave Montali (WV DEP): The toxic contaminants goal has a project really dedicated to this issue. Would this work be detailed enough to talk about our BMP impacts on PCBs?
 - Davis-Martin: I think this optimization tool would be a little broader than that, but I know this past year we funded a project to evaluate that specific issue.

- Sally Claggett (USFS): Over the course of last year the Forestry Workgroup began the Riparian Forest Buffer (RBF) initiative, and the states got a list of actions that could be used to increase enrollment and establishment of RFBs. This project begins to address those actions. The proposal calls for two full-time experts to work individually with each of the states to get these actions in place.
 - Davis-Martin: Was that a Bay Program initiative, or USDA driven?
 - Claggett: It was a Bay Program initiative. It came from the Forestry Workgroup, Farm Service Agency (FSA), and Nick DiPasquale (Director, EPA CBPO). We kicked off this initiative and used funding from FSA to hire the Alliance for the Chesapeake, but it definitely falls under the Bay Program.
 - Davis-Martin: Have FSA and USDA bought into this approach?
 - Claggett: Yes, they are 100% bought in.
 - McNally: What is USDA's involvement in this?
 - Claggett: USDA took the lead for developing the list of actions in most states. The idea at this point is also to have one of the products be a CREP amendment that will also go to USDA.
- Julie Mawhorter (USFS): Because tree canopy is a community and local government driven project, there is a strong need for community outreach. If we focused on outreach strategies for tree canopy, it would be a good way to collaborate with other goal teams such as the Diversity Action Team and Stewardship GIT, and we would be able to come up with best practices for growing local tree canopy initiatives. The first part of the proposal is to develop case studies on the best models for outreach. The second step would be to perform an in-person workshop to bring together practitioners to promote dialogue around the challenges of engaging communities, and give them the tools to address those challenges. We may still refine this proposal a little further as we work with the Stewardship GIT, Habitat GIT and Diversity Action Team.
 - Davis-Martin: Have you submitted this proposal for consideration under other GITs?
 - Mawhorter: I had planned on submitting it to this GIT and was hoping it would be considered as a cross-GIT collaboration project when it was reviewed by the GIT chairs.
 - Davis-Martin: I think that is a possibility. Thinking about the WQGIT, if you took a narrow approach, tree canopy doesn't currently have a water quality benefit in our modeling tools, but that doesn't mean it shouldn't be considered in this process.
 - McNally: Have you worked with the Chesapeake Bay Trust or anyone in EPA R3? I was thinking about the G3 grant program. Maybe this could link up to that ongoing work.
 - Mawhorter: I haven't specifically, but I would definitely like to look into it.
- Mark Dubin (UMD): The AgWG has been working over the past few years to come up with better information on poultry productions. The AgWG formed a Poultry Litter

Subcommittee, which was able to generate information specifically on boiler production, however there is still a data gap concerning commercial turkey and layer information. We have a project that is currently funded in Pennsylvania on layer production, but we also need a second project to focus on turkey production. Virginia has offered to take that on, so this funding would supplement some other funding we already have on this project. The end result would be an equation for how to simulate turkey production in the Phase 6 modeling tools, and it would replace the data from NASS.

- Davis-Martin: Didn't we previously find that there are significant differences between jurisdictions on poultry litter, so the applicability across jurisdictions would be questionable?
 - Dubin: Yes, we did see that evidence in poultry. Within turkey production, there is variability between toms and hens, or one stage and two stage, even within Virginia. Our work would be with integrators and the industry to generate information that represents that variability, and could be applied across the watershed. The data is really needed to jumpstart the process and allow the Bay Program to develop those equations.
- Greg Allen (EPA): The Toxic Contaminants Workgroup proposal is on track down studies to find PCB sources and ways to reduce those sources. Tracked down studies have come up often as the most valuable and important studies, particularly within the PCB TMDL process. It leverages existing programs, and is strongly focused on PCB reductions, which is the goal for the Policy and Prevention Management Strategy and incorporates cross-jurisdiction information sharing. We would like to produce comprehensive guidance to help achieve local TMDLs and the Management Strategies more effectively.
 - McNally: A technical workshop is recommended, is that for the jurisdictions?
 - Allen: It would likely be for a variety of stakeholders and experts including jurisdictions as well as federal regulatory experts, and some experts outside of the watershed.
- Davis-Martin: It appears we have funding proposals that add up to about double the amount of money we were told we have. I don't want to prioritize these on the call today. If you have strong feelings on priorities, please email them to Lucinda and myself, and we will go through those recommendations so that as we send the proposals forward, we can put them in some kind of prioritized order. If you could send them over as soon as possible, that would be great. We have to send these proposals forward to the GIT chairs tomorrow, and would like to do so with some sense of prioritization from the WQGIT. They all seem valid and appropriate.
- Dubin: I noticed a number of applications that have value across the GITs. Perhaps the cross-GIT projects could be separated out to reserve the budget for WQGIT-only projects.
 - Davis-Martin: I agree. We could perhaps enter some co-funding arrangement with other GITs. That is why we should send these all forward.

Discussion:

- Jeremy Hanson (VT, CBPO): We will not be asking for a decision today, so we will propose a [new schedule](#) for reaching a decision.
- Davis-Martin: Over the next few weeks, if you are changing the recommendations I think we should see what that entails. Right now, the proposal is that the wetlands land uses would have the same loading rates as the forest land use. Whatever the reasoning, if it behaves like forest, why is it important to separate it from forest as separate land uses?
 - Hanson: The loading rates are the nutrients and sediment associated with just that acre of land use, however the literature on wetlands rarely ever looks at them without the context of what is coming off of the surrounding land uses, and I don't think it allows us to get to the level of detail that we need for the Model. Quantifying the BMP benefits is the second task the Panel is evaluating.
- Davis-Martin: The way you describe wetlands is more like the way our Model simulates BMPs than land uses. I would like to challenge you to describe why wetlands need to be unique land uses as opposed to just a BMP.
 - Hanson: I think the first step is to have a representation of wetlands separate from forest, so that we can break out the number of acres.
- Davis-Martin: During our last meeting, we saw a presentation on the tree canopy land use and gave them until September 14. That really was the drop-dead deadline for having these land uses defined. I think that is the appropriate line for us to draw here as well.
 - Hanson: That is fine.
- Dubin: The AgWG is also going to be looking at wetland treatment systems, but we will not be considering them as a separate land use.
 - Hanson: We will definitely make sure there is no accidental overlap there.
- Jennifer Greiner (FWS): We will have a call with the Wetlands Workgroup between now and September 2, and we will notify the AgWG when that is scheduled so that you are welcome to join.

AMS and Agriculture Loading Rates Update -- Curtis Dell, USDA and Gene Yagow, VT

- Curt provided a brief [update](#) from the Agriculture Modeling Subcommittee and Gene and Tom Jordan will [update](#) the WQGIT on the progress towards finalizing the agricultural land use loading rates.

Discussion:

- Gene Yagow (VT): We are still working on reviewing and refining nitrogen loads. Because the variability between land uses will be captured as a function of Land River segment-based RUSLE2 erosion estimates, no further relative ratios are proposed for phosphorus and sediments. This approach has been looked at by the CBP modeling team and they are alright with this approach.
- Davis-Martin: When the RUSLE2 is run at the Land River segment scale, is it on the predominant soil type?
 - Yagow: I am not sure, it is done for each agriculture land use separately.

- Dubin: The panel has actually not had access to the RUSLE2 data yet, but they will get a chance to see that very soon.
- Davis-Martin: Which of these are going to be land use classes in the Phase 6 Model? Given the similarities between the relative nitrogen loading rate values, does it make sense to break all of these out or to aggregate some of them?
 - Tom Jordan (Smithsonian): I think when we look at the numbers, we might suggest lumping some of them. Some are rather close together or may not be able to be distinguished, but we aren't at that point yet.
 - Dubin: The basic land uses were developed in tiered systems that can be collapsed back to a more generalized land use. This is the most detailed level, and if there is a reason for the group to collapse those land uses, the structure is built in to do that.
- Davis-Martin: What is the timeline moving forward?
 - Yagow: We have a couple meetings scheduled this week.
 - Dubin: Once they have a chance to see the data from USGS and Tetra Tech (RUSLE2), it is their intention to have draft final recommendations to the AgWG in September. They would then come up to the WQGIT from there, but it depends on how long it takes to review the data.
- Beth McGee (CBF): The rates are relative to the corn without fertilizer land use, so is there a fair amount of data to set the loading rate for that land use and have the confidence to set the rest relative to that value?
 - Jordan: Corn is of course a very prevalent crop type. These loading rates are variable, and I would like to capture information about that variability even though that wasn't in our original charge.
 - Dubin: There is a reference loading, and it is adjusted in each land river segment based on the water quality monitoring data. That is where creating the relative loading values really helps.
- McNally: What does the best 3 out of 5 data points for yield refer to?
 - Curt Dell (USDA ARS): For estimating manure application rates, part of the idea is to get a yield goal. So the idea here is that we are taking an average yield goal and using it as a target to help set the manure goal. It is the average of the 3-5 highest yields because that is what the farmers are using to determine how much manure they think they need to apply to get the yields they want.

Nutrient Management Update – Chris Brosch, VA DCR

- Chris provided an update on the feedback received during the open comment period of the Phase 5.3.2 Nutrient Management Panel and gave an overview of the anticipated responses to comments.

Discussion:

- McGee: A suggestion for the future, CBF and others aren't comfortable with the Tier II phosphorus recommendations because there isn't a lot of information or data upon which to base the recommendations. Maybe as part of the BMP Protocol there should be some

established level of minimum data requirements upon which an efficiency recommendation must be based.

- Jenn Volk (Chair, UD): We can certainly consider that. We have in the past relied on best professional judgment, but I know this makes some people uncomfortable.
- Chris Brosch (VT, VA DCR): And there is a specific section in the report calling for additional research and data related to the Tier II phosphorus recommendations, so you will certainly hear that again.
- Davis-Martin: Can you clarify what the AgWG's decision to "defer consensus" means?
 - Brosch: That is the way Kristen Saacke Blunk (AgWG Co-Chair) chose to describe a lack of consensus. By Friday, the AgWG will have a memo outlining their decision and what it means. I understand it to mean that Tier II and III nitrogen recommendations had consensus approval, but the lightning rod was the Tier II phosphorus recommendation, which prevented us from reaching consensus on the full report. They also called for a team to evaluate the state programs, and that was well received by everyone on the call.
 - Dubin: The AgWG Co-chairs and I will be drafting up that document to have by the end of the week.
- Davis-Martin: In the hopes of building consensus before having to elevate this to the Management Board, I ask the dissenters to give this some more thought to see if there is a reasonable compromise that would allow for consensus.
 - Dubin: I think Chris and the panel have done all they can do at this point and now it is up to the partnership in terms of how they choose to implement the recommendations of the panel.
 - Davis-Martin: I just hope we don't repeat the same dialogue again at the WQGIT as what was discussed at the AgWG.

Adjourn

List of Call Participants

Member Name	Affiliation
Jenn Volk (Chair)	U of Delaware
James Davis-Martin (Vice-Chair)	VA DEQ
Lucinda Power (Coordinator)	EPA, CBPO
David Wood (Staff)	CRC
Lindsey Gordon (Staff)	CRC
Jessica Blackburn	CAC
Marel King	CBC
Beth McGee	CBF
George Onyullo	DDOE
John Schneider	DE DNREC
Rich Batiuk	EPA, CBPO
Jeff Sweeney	EPA, CBPO
Greg Allen	EPA, CBPO

Lew Linker	EPA, CBPO
Jen Sincock	EPA, R3
Suzanne Trevena	EPA, R3
Dianne McNally	EPA, R3
Jennifer Greiner	FWS
Jenny Tribo	HRPDC
Paula Hose	LGAC
Bruce Michael	MD DNR
Sarah Lane	MD DNR
Erin McGlaughlin	MD DNR
Dinorah Dalmasy	MDE
Lee Currey	MDE
Karl Berger	MWCOG
Norm Goulet	NVRC
Ben Sears	NY DEC
Andy Zemba	PA DEP
Tom Jordan	Smithsonian
Kevin McGonigal	SRBC
Mark Dubin	UMD, CBPO
Curt Dell	USDA ARS
Sally Claggett	USFS
Julie Mawhorter	USFS
Peter Claggett	USGS
Russ Baxter	VA Secretary of Natural Resources Office
Gene Yagow	VT
Jeremy Hanson	VT, CBPO
Chris Brosch	VT, VA DCR
Teresa Koon	WV DEP
Dave Montali	WV DEP
Ann Wakeford	WV DEP
Alana Hartman	WV DEP