

CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM
WATER QUALITY GOAL IMPLEMENTATION TEAM
August 8, 2016 CONFERENCE CALL
Meeting Minutes

Summary of Action and Decision Items

ACTION: CBP staff will work with the Modeling Team to draft a hierarchy of BMP expert panel reports that are needed by the September 30th deadline for Phase 6 Model inputs.

DECISION: The WQGIT endorsed the proposed approach of aligning the Attenuation Expert Panel report approval process with that of similar modeling decisions, rather than through the BMP Protocol report approval process.

ACTION: WQGIT signatory representatives should send nominations for membership on the Integrated Trends Monitoring Technical Team to Scott Phillips by COB August 19th.

Welcome/Confirm Call Participants/Workgroup Updates – James Davis-Martin, Chair

- Lucinda Power (Coordinator) provided an update on the status and scheduled deadlines for the Phase 6 BMP Expert Panel reports. She proposed that the September 26th WQGIT conference call become an all-day call in order to address the large number of reports.
- Dinorah Dalmasy (MDE): We don't have a problem with a full day meeting. However, we are very concerned that we won't be prepared to discuss all these BMPs by the end of September because they have not been released yet. We are concerned that we don't have the staff time to do a thorough review of that many reports in such a short period of time.
 - Davis-Martin: That is why the 30-day review period is so important. However, even with that 30 day review period, there will likely be 5-8 reports for us to review.
- Tanya Spano (MWCOG): The Wastewater Treatment Workgroup's (WWTWG) biggest concern is whether we have the staff and contractor resources to pull the boat pump-out panel report together in time for this deadline.
- Davis-Martin: At this point, I am unwilling yet to let the September 30th deadline slide, but we will eventually need to figure out how to deal with exceptions and contingencies. If we don't see the full reports in the next week or two, I don't know that we are going to be able to ask for approval during the September 26th meeting.
- Suzanne Trevena (EPA, R3): Since there are so many panel reports that need to be approved by September 30th, is there a way to somehow rank the panels by their priority level?
 - Spano: I agree, they should be ranked based on their widespread use, the significance of the load, or the impact on the calibration.
 - Lew Linker (EPA, CBPO): Using that criteria, I think we would be able to make that kind of an assessment.

- Norm Goulet (NVRC): I'd like to stick up for Workgroups who have been pushing to meet the deadlines. To turn around and tell them that all the hard work they have done is not going to be prioritized is a difficult thing to do.

ACTION: CBP staff will work with the Modeling Team to draft a hierarchy of BMP expert panel reports that are needed by the September 30th deadline for Phase 6 Model inputs.

Nutrient Attenuation Expert Panel – James Davis-Martin, Chair

James discussed the proposed approach for the review and approval of the Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems Nutrient Attenuation Expert Panel report.

Discussion:

- Spano: The WWTWG is comfortable with the proposed approach.
- Dave Montali (WV DEP): I would like to second the idea that this report is not really about a BMP, so the approach of asking the Modeling Workgroup to give the final approval makes sense.
- Dalmasy: What is the timeline for approval?
 - David Wood (CRC): We are still finalizing the dates, but the plan is to release the report for Partnership review and approval by the end of August. Then we would hold a webinar to summarize the panel recommendations within a week of the report's release. The WWTWG meeting would be re-scheduled for mid-September and the Modeling Workgroup meeting would be towards the end of September.
- Jim George (MDE): We would like to get Lee Currey's final approval, but otherwise we are ok with this approach.

DECISION: The WQGIT endorsed the proposed approach of aligning the Attenuation Expert Panel report approval process with that of similar modeling decisions, rather than through the BMP Protocol report approval process.

Measuring and Explaining Trends Update – Scott Phillips, USGS, Doug Moyer, USGS, Jeni Keisman, USGS, and Jimmy Webber, USGS

Scott Phillips provided an overview of the explaining trends project.

Discussion:

- Spano: I want to emphasize that the Potomac should be addressed holistically. It is a special case because there are multiple state contributors.
- Nicki Kasi (PA DEP): What sort of background or expertise are you looking for in members of this Integrated Monitoring Trends Technical Team?
 - Phillips: Preferably either someone doing nutrient trends work, or someone who is taking the trends information and trying to use it in the development of a state's Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP).

Doug Moyer presented USGS's results of Nitrogen, Phosphorus and Sediment Loads and River flow, based largely on monitoring from the RIM stations in the watershed. Doug also presented a USGS analysis of long and short terms trends of these loads in the Bay.

Discussion:

- Mary Gattis (LGAC): The Local Government Advisory Committee (LGAC) is undertaking an initiative to better coordinate the communications of Midpoint Assessment and Phase III WIP information with local governments. Rich and Lucinda are engaged in that effort and I would be happy to talk with you offline about getting this kind of information to those local governments.

Jeni Keisman provided an update on the approach to explaining drivers of change in nutrient inputs to the Bay watershed.

Discussion:

- Davis-Martin: Can you use these results to help us determine which BMPs are actually driving the change in phosphorus reductions in manure? I would think phytase additives would be a driver.
 - Keisman: That is exactly the type of analysis we are doing. We have run a set of isolation scenarios with just certain subsets of reported BMPs. We are looking at expected reductions due to those subsets of BMPs.
- Linker: We might want to talk offline about atmospheric deposition loss. It looks like it might be low by a factor of about 2.5 in these results.
 - Keisman: That is something our analysts are trying to take into account. This report is really focusing on agricultural inputs, but when we link trends in loads to some of these sources, atmospheric deposition is something we'd take into account.

Jimmy Webber will provide an update on water-quality trends in small watersheds using monitoring and analysis to assess and inform restoration.

Discussion:

- Davis-Martin: How much would we need to increase monitoring efforts to be able to do this kind of analysis watershed-wide?
 - Webber: All the cluster analysis and fine-scale spatial analyses is not being done in the full non-tidal network.
 - Phillips: We're showing the work that has been done in USGS watersheds, but other partners are doing similar work. When we released the Insights report a few years ago, we found about 40 similar monitoring studies.
 - Davis-Martin: It sounds like it is not realistic to do this level of analysis Bay-wide, but it might be feasible for targeting localized areas of concern.

- Moyer: We are taking a lot of this information and doing data comparisons to other stations in the non-tidal network to identify watersheds that we would expect to respond similarly.
- Spano: It would be good to understand what level of effort and investment this monitoring and additional analysis work has gained us compared to the benefits. There may be areas where investing more targeted efforts would be well worth it.
 - Bruce Michael (MD DNR): The CBP has invested a lot in citizen monitoring and we are looking into audits to determine the quality of the data we can get from other groups to use for these purposes.
 - Phillips: We can look into that type of cost analysis.

ACTION: WQGIT signatory representatives should send nominations for membership on the Integrated Trends Monitoring Technical Team to Scott Phillips by COB August 19th.

WQGIT October Face-to-Face Agenda – Teresa Koon, Vice-Chair

Teresa provided an overview of the draft agenda for the WQGIT's October 24-25th Face-to-Face meeting, developed by the planning committee, and solicited feedback from WQGIT members.

Discussion:

- Spano: My biggest concern is making sure we receive the briefing materials far enough in advance that we have time to prepare for the meeting.
 - Wood: The plan is to hold a series of webinars and presentations in advance of the face-to-face meeting that will be recorded and posted on the meeting calendar page and agenda.
- Phillips: Maybe we can find some time on the agenda to discuss approaches for bringing monitoring and explaining trends information into the Phase III WIP development process. The item would be a discussion rather than a presentation.

Adjourned

List of Call Participants:

Member Name	Affiliation
James Davis-Martin (Chair)	VA DEQ
Teresa Koon (Vice-Chair)	WV DEP
Lucinda Power (Coordinator)	EPA
David Wood (Staff)	CRC
Lindsey Gordon (Staff)	CRC
John Schneider	DE DNREC
George Onyullo	DOEE
Mary Searing	DOEE
Dinorah Dalmasy	MDE
Jim George	MDE
Bruce Michael	MD DNR

Ben Sears	NYSDEC
Sara Latessa	NYSDEC
Kristen Wolf	PA DEP
Nicki Kasi	PA DEP
Dave Montali	WV DEP
Marel King	CBC
Suzanne Trevena	EPA, R3
Jen Sincock	EPA, R3
Ann Carkhuff	EPA, R3
Lew Linker	EPA, CBPO
Bill Angstadt	Angstadt Consulting
Jenn Volk	U of Delaware
Tanya Spano	MWCOG
Beth McGee	CBF
Chris Thompson	LCCD
Norm Goulet	NVRC
Gary Shenk	USGS
Scott Phillips	USGS
Mark Dubin	UMD
Sally Claggett	USFS
Jessica Blackburn	CAC
Mary Gattis	LGAC
Jeremy Hanson	VT
Joan Smedinghoff	CRC
Angela Redwine	VDH
Jeni Keisman	USGS
John Wolf	USGS
Jimmy Webber	USGS
Doug Moyer	USGS
Ken Hyer	USGS
Karl Berger	MWCOG
Karl Blankenship	Bay Journal