

CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM
WATER QUALITY GOAL IMPLEMENTATION TEAM
May 9, 2016 CONFERENCE CALL
Meeting Minutes

Summary of Action and Decision Items

DECISION: The WQGIT approved the proposal to not include an explicit extractive land use in the Phase 6 Watershed Model. Areas known to be extractive will be simulated as “mixed open” and will be excluded from areas classed as agriculture or turf grass. Extractive acres can be added to the partnership’s suite of decision support tools (e.g. MAST or VAST) at the discretion of the jurisdictions.

ACTION: Peter Claggett will compile the number of acres classified as mixed open and turf grass on federal lands, by jurisdiction, in the Phase 5.3.2 Watershed Model in order to give jurisdictions a ballpark estimate of how many acres would be impacted by the fractional method for classifying herbaceous lands.

ACTION: Peter Claggett will present at the next WQGIT meeting to show the total acreage across the whole watershed that the fractional method would be applied to, and a few specific examples of where this fractional method would need to be applied. The WQGIT will be asked to support the use of the fractional land use method following the discussion.

ACTION: Once Lucinda has completed initial conversations with the BMP panel coordinators to identify potential policy issues with their respective panels, she will provide an update to WQGIT members as to how many panels are likely to require policy resolution.

DECISION: The WQGIT endorsed a modified approach to addressing BMP panel policy issues, which will be presented to the Management Board for their approval. The approach would emphasize the need to separate the science and policy issues, and to provide the sector workgroup chair and GIT chair with options for resolving the policy issues before proceeding with a parallel policy panel.

ACTION: WQGIT members should send any final comments on the revised MPA and Phase III WIP schedule to David and Lucinda by noon on Friday, May 13th.

Introduction and Announcements – James Davis-Martin, Chair

- James Davis-Martin (Chair) asked all WQGIT members to hold October 24-25, 2016 on their calendars for a face-to-face meeting. A planning committee will be established as we get closer to the meeting but if members have suggested topics, please let David and Lucinda know.
- James reviewed the consensus continuum and asked members to please consider it as the group works through decisional items.

Update on Fractional Land Use Model and Extractive Land Use – Peter Claggett, USGS

- Peter Claggett (USGS) reviewed the options for simulating extractive lands in the Phase 6 Model and posed two questions to the WQGIT:
 - Does the WQGIT support extractive as a separate land use in the Phase 6 Model?

- If extractive is not a separate land use, does the WGQIT support including extractive lands in the “mixed open” land use in Phase 6?

Discussion:

- Davis-Martin: During our last meeting, Maryland expressed a desire to have extractive simulated separately in Phase 6. Where does Maryland stand on this issue now? Do any of these efforts that Peter described help alleviate your concerns?
 - Dinorah Dalmasy (MDE): Having the extractive data in MAST and other data tools helps us a lot. We are not going to object to this moving forward without extractive lands. We still feel they are regulatory lands and that they should be explicitly modeled. We do not want to argue against using the mixed open loading rates. We don’t have data now, though we will be collecting it as part of the permits for the future, so the mixed open loading rate we feel is reasonable. We don’t want regulated lands to be lumped with nonregulated lands, but it is a small load in Maryland and we are going to go with what the group decides. We also want to point out that there are BMPs on this land.
- Davis-Martin: Yes, erosion and sediment control (ESC) and abandoned mine reclamation (AMR) are both on extractive lands. AMR would still be eligible on mixed open and would convert to forest, correct?
 - Matt Johnston (UMD): Correct. ESC on extractive would also be eligible on mixed open unless the group tells us otherwise.
- Davis-Martin: Are there any thoughts or concerns from Pennsylvania and West Virginia?
 - Ted Tesler (PA DEP): We are okay with not including an extractive land use in Phase 6. Would the land use loads associated with mixed open be attributed to the urban sector? Or are they their own category?
 - Johnston: They are currently lumped into the natural sector, but that could be a future discussion to have.
 - Tesler: I think the natural category is a fine place for those loads.
 - Dave Montali (WV DEP): We do not want it as a land use and are okay with having those lands included in mixed open. Looking at the imagery you just presented, it looked like there were areas mapped that were not active but maybe reclaimed or undisturbed in the imagery. Either way, whatever is most practical is fine. Don’t use permit bonded area as disturbed mine land.
 - Claggett: That makes sense. We’ll be using high resolution land cover data as well, so if that data say they are forested, they will be forested. We will be looking specifically at the areas that show up as barren or herbaceous.
- Davis-Martin: Maryland is willing to stand aside as long as extractive can be simulated in MAST. Are there any other objections?
 - None were raised.
- Beth McGee (CBF): I don’t have a concern, but the point about herbaceous and barren going into mixed open will be important to convey because there are concerns about how fracking will be simulated. If land cover picks those sites up as impervious, it will be simulated as impervious.
 - Sarah Diebel (DOD): I agree.

DECISION: The WQGIT approved the proposal to not include an explicit extractive land use in the Phase 6 Model. Areas known to be extractive will be simulated as “mixed open” and will be excluded from areas classed as agriculture or turf grass. Extractive acres can be added to the partnership’s suite of decision support tools (MAST, VAST, or CAST) at the discretion of the jurisdictions.

- Claggett: It is really important to keep in mind that when we’re talking about this fractional land use method, we are only talking about a methodology for better simulating land uses that show up in our datasets as barren or herbaceous lands.
- Diebel: Are we going to discuss this approach with the Federal Facilities Workgroup?
 - Claggett: Federal facilities are unique because we are developing the federal facility editor tool so that facility managers can tell us what the breakdown is based on their knowledge of the site.
 - Diebel: So how does this reconcile with that effort?
 - Claggett: Here we are asking what the default method would be for federal facilities in the event that we don’t get any additional information from the facility managers.
 - Diebel: Thanks, that makes sense.
- Montali: Is this an aggregation issue or an issue of needing a way to define herbaceous lands as something other than mixed open? If, in your example, the box were all herbaceous, would we still have this problem?
 - Claggett: Yes. If the box was all herbaceous, we will still use ancillary local data to tell us what that herbaceous land actually is.
 - Davis-Martin: Herbaceous includes many different things, many of which have specific land uses in Phase 6. That is the challenge.
- Tanya Spano (MWCOC): What is the order of magnitude for these herbaceous lands? Do we know how many acres there are or what the load is?
 - Claggett: I don’t know the acreage exactly, but the federal lands is the largest area we’re talking about. Overall, I don’t think it is very significant at the watershed scale, but I think it is very significant at the local scale and for WIP planning, as well as for federal facility managers.
- Diebel: For federal facilities, we are trying to implement a process so everyone will enter the acreages of these land uses into the editor tool. I do have a concern about the difference between the national parks versus other federal facilities. I think there will be a difference in the ratio between the different types of facilities.
 - Claggett: I agree. I think it is incumbent upon those federal facility managers to participate in this effort. We are trying to figure out the ratios by the end of this week.
- Diebel: What is the methodology Maryland and Virginia are using to quantify those fractional ratios?
 - Claggett: MDE is looking at aerial imagery and using visual interpretation to determine turf grass versus fallow lands. Virginia is doing a very similar process.
- Montali: Whether these lands are fertilized or not is the biggest key. Why not call them all mixed open and move on?
 - Claggett: I think mixed open underestimates the load from these lands, to be honest. I think if anything it would be more accurate to go back to the method we’re using in

Phase 5.3.2 and assume that all of these lands are turf grass. They are often compacted, and frequently have fertilizer application. I think if the default for all federal facilities was mixed open, there would be little to no incentive to do anything but accept that, because the loads are so low.

- Montali: I agree with the comment that all federal facilities aren't the same. If there are a few big players, maybe there can be case-by-case decisions for just those facilities, based on the advice from federal partners.
 - Diebel: That is the plan. We just still need a default in case we don't get engagement.
- Davis-Martin: Ultimately, we need to re-categorize these lands through some means. We need to either call all herbaceous lands turf grass, or call all herbaceous lands mixed open, unless we go to some kind of fractional method. I agree we will need to make some assumptions. In my view, it makes sense that some herbaceous lands on each parcel are more like turf and some are more like mixed open. Understanding that we don't have the details on the actual fractions yet, I support the use of fractional land uses. That said, I would want to revisit this again once we understand what the fractions are. Conceptually, I am supportive of the approach.
- Mary Searing (DOEE): Would this approach impact D.C. even though it is predominantly urban?
 - Claggett: Yes, we are talking about urban facilities as well. We do have a lot of polygons of federal lands in D.C. that this method would apply to, like the Smithsonian. Again, we are just talking about herbaceous lands in those polygons.
- Searing: I would need to understand the impact on D.C. before I could make an informed decision.
- Spano: I think the point is that folks don't know if this method is worth pursuing because we don't have an understanding of the acres that this is applied to.
- Claggett: What we can do, since we don't have the high resolution land cover for the whole watershed yet, is look at the mixed open and turf acres on federal lands in Phase 5.3.2 by jurisdiction. That will give you a ballpark of the acreages we are talking about. That ballpark will change depending on whether we use a method that assumes 100% turf, 100% open or some fraction, but it can give you a sense. Just remember that every agency has the chance to give us very detailed fractions.
- Davis-Martin: You don't see local governments being able to make those same edits?
 - Claggett: We restricted this to federal facilities because of the scale. It is more manageable, and the facility managers have an intimate knowledge of what is on their facility. We didn't think it was right to do that at the county scale.

ACTION: Peter Claggett will compile the number of acres classified as mixed open and turf grass on federal lands, by jurisdiction, in the Phase 5.3.2 Watershed Model in order to give jurisdictions a ballpark estimate of how many acres would be impacted by the fractional method for classifying herbaceous lands.

- Montali: How are non-federal land uses specified?
 - Claggett: It's determined based on local land use data.
- Searing: If we fine-tune this, how does it improve the Watershed Model? If we adjust this land use, how will it impact results?

- Claggett: If an area is 100% turf, it will load like turf grass. If it is a mixture, it will load like a mixture. It is like coming up with a slightly adjusted loading rate without altering our existing structure.
- Davis-Martin: Do you envision the need for a BMP that would allow for reporting a land that was assumed to be turf but was truly mixed open?
 - Claggett: In reality, that is what is happening, but I want to make clear that we are not introducing this fraction as a land use by itself. When the data is received, you will not see the fractions. It will all tally up to our current land use acres.
- Davis-Martin: If we don't approve this approach, what would the process be for categorizing these herbaceous acres?
 - Claggett: I would push strongly for the default to be that 100% of herbaceous acres go to turf grass for everything on the list I presented. Federal facilities can correct that if they have better information. That is the approach we used in Phase 5.3.2, and is a load that is in-between impervious and mixed open.
 - Diebel: How would local governments feel about that? It seems more appropriate to do the fraction or ratio of two types of land uses.
- Spano: My concern is that if it is worth breaking it out, but the localities are not managing how it might vary in different places, it sends mixed messages.
 - Ted Tesler (PA DEP): I agree. I think if we go with option 1 instead of the fractional approach, I can see the blue group of land uses going to 100% mixed open and the yellow group going to 100% turf.
 - Claggett: I think that would be a reasonable option 1.
 - Diebel: We wouldn't support that.
- Montali: I thought rules for turf had to do with proximity to impervious areas.
 - Claggett: That is one of the rules. It depends on if we have parcel data. It depends on the size of the building relative to the parcel, or if we have land use data.
- Spano: This sounds like something that could be verified or found to be untrue at the local scale, so I wonder why you excluded this from being reviewed by locals.
 - Claggett: The only difference between the counties and the federal facilities is that we are allowing federal facility managers to adjust the percent of turf compared to mixed open and impervious. Other than that, everyone is privy to the same information. Counties gave us land use and parcel data, and here we are proposing a way to use that data to its utmost capabilities.
- Davis-Martin: On the consensus continuum, I could live with this proposal. It sounds like Mary Searing and Tanya Spano are requesting a hold.
 - Tesler: I would say that we would be hesitant to go down the fractional loads path without having Pennsylvania lands studied or included in the domain of what we are classifying.
 - Montali: I am standing aside. It is not that big of a deal to me, but if there is more time to assess this we should take advantage of it.
 - Marya Levelev (MDE): Maryland agrees with the fractional approach.
 - Diebel: We are in support of the fractional approach.
 - Jenn Volk (U of Delaware): I also support the fractional approach.

- Davis-Martin: Mary and Tanya, are you alright conceptually with the idea of using a fractional approach, with the actual fractions and how it is applied still in question?
 - Searing: I would like more information, and I am still concerned with how this relates back to the loading rates and the EMCs. Aren't they already aggregated to go to this level of detail? I thought the numbers we had been using took all the disparate parts together. If we try to fine-tune it, I don't know we have the values to support it in terms of the loads.
 - Spano: I would say conceptually it makes sense. My concern is similar to Mary's, that there would be a parsing of these acres that is not transparent. If it is elective, then I would be supportive of it. I don't see any reason not to do it except I am concerned about transparency.
 - Davis-Martin: I think the rule set would be transparent, but when they look at the land uses, it wouldn't be as transparent. I think that would be true even if we didn't use a fractional approach because you still need assumptions.
 - Marel King (CBC): I agree with Mary and Tanya's questions. Are we thinking the assumed fraction would have a high enough loading rate to drive the land owners to provide more specific information? Or will some acres load higher than reality and some lower and it will come out even in the end?
- Claggett: I will have to get the acreages to you. I really don't think this is a very consequential decision, though I understand you wanting assurance of that. I can show some overlays of where we called things mixed open and where we didn't. But like James said, there will always be someone unhappy with a localized call we have to make. That will be a challenge with Phase 6. We have much better data than we've ever had, but someone will always find fault with specific places.
- Davis-Martin: We can't get a decision today. We can put you on the agenda for our next meeting. Please tell us, as best you can, the acreage total across the whole watershed that this method would be applied to, and a few examples of where this fractional method would need to be applied.
 - Claggett: I can put these overlays on aerial images for you to get a sense of specific examples.
 - Davis-Martin: We will also make sure we have results from the Maryland and Virginia fractions.

ACTION: Peter Claggett will present at the next WQGIT meeting the total acreage across the whole watershed that this method would be applied to, and a few specific examples of where this fractional method would need to be applied. The WQGIT will be asked to support the use of the fractional land use method following the discussion.

- Claggett: We would like to move forward with these groupings. They were approved by the Land Use Workgroup (LUWG) with input from the Urban Stormwater Workgroup (USWG). If you want to change the fractional percentages, that's okay, but if the groupings themselves are up in the air, that is going to delay our ability to provide final land uses.
 - Davis-Martin: The groupings of these land uses is one of the pieces I am least comfortable with. Road right of ways is one specific concern. Are others comfortable with them?

- John Schneider (DE DNREC): I don't think lumping road right of ways where they are is accurate. I think the mixed open/impervious split would make more sense.
- Davis-Martin: What about giving the locals, in their review, the opportunity to change the groupings? Is that reasonable?
 - Claggett: Offhand I would say no. That will incur too much of a delay. I will talk to my team and give it more thought. We are stuck until we resolve which land uses fall into which groups.
- Davis-Martin: Are we in a place where we can live with these groupings?
 - Tesler: Is this something we would want to see go back down to the LUWG for consideration?
 - Davis-Martin: The LUWG have already made their decision and this is what they passed forward. I think it would be good for the USWG to look at these before there is a decision. There is one issue for me with road right of ways, but the rest I think are pretty well placed. If we had to move forward with something, this is close.
 - Spano: I am okay with that as long as there is a way to change the default fractions in the future.
 - Claggett: There is a mechanism for federal facilities to change the percentages. There is not a mechanism for counties to do that and it is not built into the schedule. I honestly think that is overkill for the effect it would have, and it would kill our timeline.
- Davis-Martin: We will not be able to get a decision on either approving the fractions or improving the land use groupings. It looks like there will be a two week delay.

Process for Addressing BMP Policy Issues

- Rich walked through the revised proposed procedures for addressing policy issues raised during the BMP expert panel process, highlighting changes and areas where feedback was specifically addressed. Rich mentioned that comments were also received from PA DEP and Bill Angstadt that were not addressed in the edits, but which could be raised for Management Board consideration.

Discussion:

- King: So there wouldn't necessarily be a standing policy resolution committee, but a separate group of folks for each BMP?
- Batiuk: Yes. The recommendation is to convene a group to address each panel's set of policy issues. The GITs would identify the policy experts and the Management Board would convene them to resolve the issues. Those experts would likely be different depending on the subject area. Hopefully there is not a need for 19 different groups that would get to that level.
- King: I understand the reasoning behind this proposal, but am apprehensive about adding so many moving parts.
- Nicki Kasi (PA DEP): Do you know how many panels have a potential need for a policy group? I think the Management Board wanted to get a sense as to whether there would be closer to 19 or two?

- Batiuk: Lucinda has been talking with the panel coordinators to try and get a better read for which ones would rise up to the top.
- Power: For some panels it is too early to tell, but I think we have about 5 or 6 that the Management Board and others would be interested in diving into a little deeper to those policy issues.
- Batiuk: When that work is finished, we can send it around to the WQGIT members so you can have a sense of that feedback.

ACTION: Once Lucinda has completed initial conversations with the BMP panel coordinators to identify the potential for policy issues, she will provide an update to WQGIT members as to how many panels are likely to require policy resolution.

- Davis-Martin: I would say any practice that could be used for trading could be marked down as a policy issue. I would assume more panels would need this policy group than not.
- Batiuk: What we are trying to do is create a separation between the panel charge and the policy issues, so we can move those technical recommendations forward, and be able to pull out the policy concerns. We are hoping this process can be put in parallel and move us forward in a quicker fashion.
 - Spano: I think it is important to keep that separation. If you have real policy issues, the Management Board has that responsibility. How will the Workgroups, who convened those panels and have responsibility for defining the scope, be involved? I'm not saying they should develop the policy recommendations in lieu of the Management Board, but they should be involved.
 - Batiuk: Excellent point. Because the Sector Workgroups are close to the issue, we should be sure that they provide feedback to the GIT and Management Board on not only the list of the issues, but provide guidance on who the members to the policy group should be.
 - Spano: Right, the Workgroups made the decisions about the panel scope, so if something new comes up, we should get their opinions early.
 - Kasi: If the Sector Workgroup is already summarizing the issues and providing guidance, that leads us back to our recommendation. If they have the expertise to go ahead and lay out the issues, why create another group? Frankly, it is going to be the same people.
 - Batiuk: We received and documented PA DEP's comments. I heard a different request from the Management Board, but we can bring that issue up with them to see which group they would prefer to be involved.
 - Davis-Martin: Would that address PA DEP's concern, if we list in the document another approach for the Management Board to consider? I tend to agree that it will extend the time this process takes.
 - Kasi: I just don't see how creating another Workgroup will streamline an already complicated process.
 - Bill Angstadt (Angstadt Consulting): From the AGWG perspective, we have five ongoing panels that are made up of members of the Workgroup who have a long history in the program and

experience with tracking, reporting, etc. The one panel that is on a bumpy road now is Manure Treatment Technology, which has panel members that don't have the same familiarity with the Bay Program partnership structure. If these policy folks are from out of the watershed or are not familiar with how these panels work, it will be very disruptive in the process. I appreciate the proposal and the Management Board's desire to have final signoff, but I would advocate for having people at the table, at least for the AGWG, who are the technical experts.

- Searing: We don't really have an opinion on this issue. We are okay with whatever the group decides.
- Davis-Martin: I am hearing that there are concerns that perhaps this is another layer within the partnership that would duplicate work being done elsewhere. This could be a change to the process that may not be warranted. We have a process in place to consider policy issues at the GIT level. I don't know that I see a clear path forward for this here. I don't think we have consensus.
- McGee: I hear the concerns about adding another layer of bureaucracy, but we want to make sure there is a period to weigh in on policy issues. If this process isn't the right path, how do you see it playing out?
 - Davis-Martin: I would say that we ask the question of the GIT. In the case of the Oyster panel, it is a bit more complex than our traditional BMPs. We would ask each GIT for their views and we would include those recommendations, as necessary, before we include the practice in the modeling tools. If we don't reach consensus at the GIT level, we would ask for the decision to be elevated up to the Management Board. I think my comments were more about the proposed changes as it relates to the larger universe of BMP panels.
- McGee: I don't disagree that the WQGIT could discuss these issues, but I still think there needs to be a group that meets to determine a reasonable set of solutions. I think asking the GIT to make those resolutions is going to lead to a lot of long discussions and extra meetings.
- Kasi: My understanding is that these expert panels are getting bogged down because the panels are trying to solve science and policy. The key is to split this out. Let the panel do their science and be done, and the policy issues are separated out into a separate policy document.
 - McGee: I agree with the separating the technical recommendations from the nitty gritty policy stuff.
- Kasi: We need the panel to at least qualify the issues so that someone can react to them. Then we are also suggesting that the public comment period happen at the same time. A lot of times you can't understand all the science until you understand the policy ramifications.
- Angstadt: In Rich's document, once the policy issues have been identified, they are raised to the GIT chair. The panel coordinator should identify the policy issues and raise them to the Workgroup. Then, if the issues can't be resolved, it goes to the GIT. I think we are taking away the ability of the Sector Workgroups to resolve these problems before the Management Board intercedes.
 - Davis-Martin: I agree.
- Batiuk: This is excellent input. To pick up on what Bill said, the panel coordinator could identify the policy issues and notify the Workgroup chair and GIT chair, and they could look at those issues together and can decide to either charge the Workgroup with resolving them, form another small group of Workgroup and GIT members to bring together a straw man to take to

the GIT, or if it is a larger issue, raise it to a policy group at the Management Board level. This would give options to Sector Workgroup and GIT chairs based on their judgement as to how to resolve the policy issues.

- Angstadt: I would want to emphasize that the Management Board policy group should be a last resort.
 - Batiuk: I agree unless someone like James or his counterparts in other GITs look at the issues and recommend that it go to a Management Board level policy group. Otherwise, the preferred approach is to work it through the Sector Workgroup level.
- Angstadt: I could endorse a process where the Sector Workgroups are allowed to wrestle with policy issues and the policy group is a last resort.
 - Spano: That approach would address my concern of the Workgroups being involved.
- Jessica Blackburn (CAC Coordinator): I wasn't able to participate in the Management Board meeting where this discussion was held. Was the Management Board saying they wanted to be involved in the policy decision?
 - Batiuk: They didn't spend a lot of time on that particular issue. Because the Oyster Panel is so unique and crosses multiple GITs, I think they had that in mind.
- Blackburn: Have you shared this proposal with the Fisheries GIT or other GITs, specifically as it related to the Oyster Panel?
 - Batiuk: Yes, in mid-April we sent the draft proposal to all GIT chairs and coordinators and to all Advisory Committee coordinators.
- Ann Swanson (CBC): I was at the Management Board meeting and the issue really was that there are going to be expert panels where the issues are contentious enough that they require not only the advice that we sought from the technical experts, but a policy layer on how best to apply the expert panel's advice. The discussion so far, of having the panel segregate their science and policy issues, is extremely helpful. The degree to which the GIT members can resolve issues at that level, all the better because you are the experts we rely upon. There was recognition that there will be cases when something will be bumped up, and the sooner those issues can be identified for the Management Board, the better. There are about 4 or 5 panels where that may be needed.
- Batiuk: Rather than ask for full consensus, can we bring something forward to the Management Board that captures this discussion? We would emphasize the separation of science and policy issues, and the concept of providing the Sector Workgroup GIT chairs with options for resolving the issues at a technical level, and as a last resort, with a parallel policy panel.
- Davis-Martin: Can the WQGIT endorse that approach?
 - Jim George (MDE): We can stand behind that as long as there is communication in a timely manner to the Management Board, if needed, so they can start wrapping their heads around the issue.
 - Kasi: I can support that approach. I would just add that it sounds like the policy group would be needed more often than not if it crosses multiple GITs. Maybe we can identify some examples of those instances.
 - George Onyullo (DOEE): We support the modified approach.
- Davis-Martin: Are there any other concerns, not with approving the proposal as originally written, but with the new proposed approach captured in today's discussion?
 - No objections were raised.

DECISION: The WQGIT endorsed a modified approach to addressing BMP panel policy issues, which will be presented to the Management Board for their approval. The approach would emphasize the need to separate the science and policy issues, and to provide the Sector Workgroup chair and GIT chair with options for resolving the issues at a technical level, before proceeding with a parallel policy panel as a last resort.

Revised MPA and Phase III WIP Schedule – Lucinda Power, EPA and James Davis-Martin, VA DEQ

- Lucinda provided an overview of the comments received on the revised alternatives document, and the WQGIT was asked to indicate their preferred option for MPA and Phase III WIP Schedule revisions.

Which alternative to the proposed schedule can you NOT support?

Option 1 – 46% (6)

Option 2 – 8% (1)

Option 3 – 0% (0)

Option 4 – 38% (5)

I can live with any – 16% (2)

Ben Sears, NYSDEC – 1

Beth McGee, CBF – 4

Bill Angstadt – can live with any

Teresa Koon, WVDEP – 1

Jen Sincock, EPA – 4

George Onyullo, DOEE- 1

John Schneider, DE DNREC– 1

Nicki Kasi, PADEP – 2

Jim George, MDE – 4

Sarah Diebel, DoD – 4

Marel King, CBC – 4

Jenn Volk, UD – can live with any

Tanya Spano, MWCOG – 1

James Davis-Martin, VADEQ – 1

Which alternative is your first preference?

Option 1 – 15% (2)

Option 2 – 38% (5)

Option 3 – 32% (4)

Option 4 – 15% (2)

Ben Sears, NYSDEC – 3

Beth McGee, CBF – 2

Teresa Koon, WVDEP – 2

Jen Sincock, EPA – 1

George Onyullo, DOEE – 4

John Schneider, DE DNREC – 3

James Davis-Martin, VADEQ – 4

Nicki Kasi, PADEP – 3

Tanya Spano, MWCOG – 2

Sarah Diebel, DoD – 2

Marel King, CBC – 1

Jenn Volk, UD – 3

Jim George, MDE – 2

Which alternative is your second preference?

Option 1 – 15% (2)

Option 2 – 39% (5)

Option 3 – 31% (4)

Option 4 – 15% (2)

John Schneider, DE DNREC – 3

Jenn Volk, UD – 3

Teresa Koon, WVDEP – 2

George Onyullo, DOEE – 4

Beth McGee, CBF – 2

Jen Sincock, EPA – 1

Ben Sears, NYSDEC – 3

James Davis-Martin, VADEQ – 4

Sarah Diebel, DoD – 2

Marel King, CBC – 1

Jim George, MDE – 2

Nicki Kasi, PADEP – 3

Tanya Spano, MWCOG – 2

Discussion:

- Davis-Martin: Please take a few moments to explain your stances or raise any other comments that you would like to have included for the record.
- Sincok: EPA can't live with option 3 or 4 because we would like to keep the original deadlines for the Phase III WIPs.
 - Davis-Martin: If we keep same dates for everything on the schedule, you need to be willing to concede that the expectations for what the Phase III WIPs will include will need to be less.
 - Kasi: We need the Phase III WIP expectations and planning targets before we decide anything concrete.
 - Sincok: We understand the concerns. That is EPA's position.
- McGee: CBF also can't live with option 3 for the same reasons Jennifer outlined. Frankly, it is also 2 years away and it is too soon to move that deadline. We also feel that EPA can release Phase III WIP expectations without the final targets and that local outreach can begin earlier.
- Spano: For locals who have to do implementation, generic guidance and generic numbers or plans are not helpful. We need to know the order of magnitude and get into specifics. Option 2 gives us targets we can start to work towards. Artificial deadlines that we can't meet sets us up for failure.
 - Davis-Martin: I will echo those same concerns.
- Kasi: The only concern I have (why I said no to option 2), is that I don't want numbers to come out before the final review of the model. If there is a change, I will spend my whole time defending the new numbers because the credibility will be gone.
- Lee Currey (MDE): We need to make sure folks are reviewing the details early. We need a commitment that the fatal flaw review will happen in detail, and if the targets are released, that will give people a reason to really dig into the model review.
- Davis-Martin: If we move forward with local targets, we want them to be based on final planning targets. As Tanya said, we need to be able to go to local governments with those necessary levels of effort needed to achieve the planning targets.
 - Currey: I understand that point, but my experience is everyone becomes interested in the results once there is a target. We need something that encourages people to look into the details.
- Currey: Maryland is in favor of not extending the schedule at all. That would be options 1 and 2, not 3 and 4.

- Diebel: As far as EPA representing the federal government, there should be a federal family consensus prior to the Management Board meeting.
 - Sincock: Thank you, Sarah.
- Spano: If we can at least identify the order of magnitude that is left to achieve – at a large scale versus a local scale – that would be a compromise between Local Area Targets being issued before the final Phase 6 Model has been fully vetted.

ACTION: WQGIT members should send any final comments on the revised MPA and Phase III WIP schedule to David and Lucinda by noon on Friday, May 13th.

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
Jason Keppler	MDA
Jim George	MDE
Dinorah Dalmasy	MDE
Lee Currey	MDE
Bruce Michael	MD DNR
Ben Sears	NYSDEC
Kristen Wolf	PA DEP
Nicki Kasi	PA DEP
Ted Tesler	PA DEP
Dave Montali	WV DEP
Marel King	CBC
Ann Jennings	CBC
Ann Swanson	CBC
Rich Batiuk	EPA, CBPO
Jeff Sweeney	EPA, CBPO
Jen Sincock	EPA, R3
Suzanne Trevena	EPA, R3
Chris Day	EPA, R3
Ann Carkhuff	EPA, R3
Bill Angstadt	Angstadt Consulting
Tanya Spano	MWCOG
Jenn Volk	U of Delaware

Sarah Diebel	DOD
Beth McGee	CBF
Jessica Blackburn	CAC
Natalie Gardner	STAC
Norm Goulet	NVRC
Mark Dubin	UMD, CBPO
Matt Johnston	UMD, CBPO
Peter Claggett	USGS
Jeremy Hanson	VT, CBPO
Sally Claggett	USFS
Jenny Tribo	HRPDC
Scott Phillips	USGS
Julie Reichert	ORP
Karl Blankenship	Bay Journal
Karl Berger	MWCOG