

Water Quality Goal Implementation Team

Face-to-Face Meeting Summary

October 7-8, 2014

Day 1:

Modeling Workgroup, WQGIT & STAR: Roles and Responsibilities in Midpoint Assessment

DECISION: The WQGIT approved the proposed set of roles for STAR, Modeling Workgroup, and WQGIT.

ACTION: STAR Co-Chairs will go back to the Management Board and seek approval for an expanded STAR membership with a focus on getting more jurisdictional representatives on the Team's membership.

Use of Monitoring/Factors Affecting Trends

ACTION: Joel Blomquist will share the URL address for accessing the USGS Chesapeake Bay non-tidal water quality monitoring network web site.

ACTION: STAR will provide the WQGIT an update of the phased BASIN review process at an upcoming WQGIT monthly conference call.

ACTION: STAR will continue to work closely with the WQGIT on the following next steps on expanding the use of monitoring data within the midpoint assessment, with a focus on factoring in new understandings from work underway on explaining monitoring trends.

- Further discussion with WQGIT members is needed on where to focus the explaining monitoring trends work—e.g., specific source sectors or at the local level—and exactly how members would like to see the results presented
 - **NOTE:** WQGIT and STAR will work together to schedule future discussions to explore moving forward with one/both/other options
- The jurisdictions need to help prioritize geographic areas where progress is being made and where further improvements are needed so changes can be made/resources can be targeted.
- Identify ways to use monitoring data to more clearly illustrate the connection between implementation of practices and the impact of those actions.
- Strengthen communication of monitoring success stories as well as areas where the trends are heading in the wrong direction and need improvement (e.g., the Insights Report).

Revising Modeling System Structure – Phase 6

ACTION: To help ensure the Modeling Workgroup will be successful in quantifying uncertainty in the 2016 timeframe, WQGIT members are asked to draft up their questions/needs in regards to uncertainty analysis and provide them to the Modeling Workgroup co-chairs.

DECISION: Updates, decisions, and assumptions of the Modeling Workgroup will be documented and posted online (WQGIT's midpoint assessment website:

http://www.chesapeakebay.net/groups/group/water_quality_goal_implementation_team)

Improve Land Use

DECISION: The WQGIT decided to add a protected lands overlay to the current list of overlays.

DECISION: The WQGIT approved moving forward with the proposed land uses, including trampled riparian pasture as a possible land use, as the maximum list of land uses. Forthcoming decisions by the Modeling Workgroup on each set of land use's associated loading rates may lead to modifications in the final Phase 6 land use classifications.

DECISION: The WQGIT agreed to support continued development of the stream corridor land use/overlay by the Land Use Workgroup through USGS by applying the results of the West Virginia University pilot study across the entire Chesapeake Bay watershed. A final decision on exactly how to apply the stream corridor lands within the Phase 6 Watershed Model—either as an actual land use or as an overlay—will be decided by the WQGIT at a later date.

ACTION: The WQGIT charged the Urban Stormwater Workgroup with updating the 2011 MS4 overlay with the most recent sets of data.

Day 2:

Updated 2014 Land Use Projections

DECISION: The WQGIT approved adopting the updated 2014 land use projections. The jurisdictions have a two week period, through October 20, to review their updated 2014 land use projections and identify any questions or significant changes that they need Chesapeake Bay Program Office staff to further investigate.

Trapping Capacity of Dams and Local Impoundments:

ACTION: The Modeling Workgroup will work to refine the schedule of needed actions and decisions related to enhancing both the Phase 6 Watershed Model and the Chesapeake Water Quality/Sediment Transport Model with new data and information on the lower Susquehanna River watershed's three dams and reservoirs and the transport and fate of nutrients and sediment from the lower Susquehanna River watershed and dams/reservoirs in the upper Chesapeake Bay. The Modeling Workgroup will ensure all these refinements can be made in the context of the overall agreed to schedule approved by the WQGIT.

ACTION: The Modeling Workgroup will further develop options for how it can address the thousands of impoundments mapped throughout the Chesapeake Bay watershed within the Phase 6 Watershed Model.

ACTION: The jurisdictions will respond to the Modeling Workgroup's forthcoming data call for more information on the mapped small impoundments.

Future Decision: What does the new information suggest and how will it be incorporated into the Phase 6 Watershed Model? What is the impact to the TMDL and WIPs?

Tidal James River Chlorophyll-a Water Quality Standards Reevaluation

DECISION: The WQGIT approved the standing request for a STAC sponsored independent scientific peer reviews of the proposed revised chlorophyll a criteria for the tidal James River, the James River watershed model, and the James River tidal water quality model.

DECISION: The WQGIT agreed to continue to proceed forward with the schedule and process as presented, recognizing more work needs to be done by the Modeling Workgroup in firming up exactly how the set of James River watershed/tidal James River water quality models will ‘communicate’ with the Partnership’s Phase 6 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Model and Chesapeake Bay Water Quality/Sediment Transport Model.

Future Decision: The WQGIT agreed that upon publication of the revised James River chlorophyll a criteria, the WQGIT and the represented jurisdictions will further consider the more widespread application of these revised chlorophyll a criteria across the rest of the Chesapeake Bay’s tidal waters, with emphasis on their use in ensuring a more complete protection of aquatic life designated uses.

Future Decision: The WQGIT will discuss how the models/information will be used/incorporated into the current Chesapeake Bay Program modeling system.

Future Virginia Decision: Virginia will determine how the final set of revised chlorophyll a criteria and application of their James River watershed and tidal James River water quality models will affect their current waste load and load allocations for the James River watershed.

Agriculture Modeling Subcommittee: Model Data Processing & Modeling Baseline

DECISION: The WQGIT decided that obtaining biosolids data from wastewater treatment facilities is still a midpoint assessment priority and that June 2015 is the deadline for providing that data to the Chesapeake Bay Program Office’s Modeling Team. Tetra Tech contract support is available to the jurisdictions if they need assistance to collecting that data.

ACTION: Curt Dell, Matt Johnston, and Gary Shenk will meet to review the schedule of work for the Agriculture Modeling Subcommittee to ensure it is meeting the scheduled needs of the Phase 6 Watershed Model Team.

ACTION: The Agriculture Modeling Subcommittee will determine if and where it could use additional resources—staff, contractor, and funding—to better ensure it can deliver on its lengthy list of products and delivered as presented at the meeting. Curt Dell, Chair, and Matt Johnston, Coordinator, will work directly with Rich Batiuk, EPA CBPO, on addressing those resource needs.

ACTION: The WQGIT requested additional definitions of volatilization.

Watershed Model Calibration Methods

DECISION: The WQGIT decided that the Phase 6 Watershed Model calibration and review schedule will form the core schedule upon which the rest of the midpoint assessment schedule will be based.

ACTION: Lucinda Power will take the lead in working with the WQGIT’s workgroups and the Modeling Workgroup to ensure their respective work and deliverable schedules match up with the Phase 6 Watershed Model calibration and review schedule. She will incorporate all other midpoint assessment deadlines and decision points into the calibration/review schedule.

ACTION: The Modeling Workgroup requested that all data be submitted as soon as possible. The sooner the data is received for incorporation into the Phase 6 Watershed Model’s version of Scenario Builder, the more similar the prototype working versions of the watershed model and scenario builder will look like the 2016 versions of the model/Scenario Builder.

Historic Data Cleanup

DECISION: The WQGIT agreed that the seven watershed jurisdictions will focus their historic BMP database clean-up from 2000 to the present, while still encouraging each jurisdiction to clean-up their entire BMP data record to support both Phase 6 Watershed Model calibration and ongoing work on explaining the long term monitoring data trends in the watershed and tidal waters. The CBPO modeling team will focus on historic data from 1985-1999.

ACTION: The Watershed Technical Workgroup will identify what resources are needed to ensure all seven jurisdictions will have their respective historic data cleanups done and complete by October 2015.

ACTION: The Watershed Technical Workgroup will revisit BMP lifespan considerations at a future WQGIT conference call.

Summary and Wrap up

ACTION: CBPO staff will work with the WQGIT Chair and Vice Chair to incorporate a detailed scheduled for the topics for the upcoming monthly WQGIT conference call agendas into the detailed MPA schedule to be developed as an action item from this meeting.