

Phase 6.0 Review Update

Agriculture Workgroup

September 20, 2017

Water Quality GIT Conference Call

August 28

- [Letter from Management Board](#) regarding BMP verification
 - Reminder to ensure all reported BMP practices are implemented and maintained
- Alisha Mulkey provided summary of August 21 AgWG ad hoc conference call regarding P concerns during the Fatal Flaw Review
 - Matt Johnston provided Modeling Workgroup response and possible paths forward
 - **No resolution on AgWG concerns- moves up to Management Board**
 - Sector equity of considering soil phosphorus (P) as a source of P loss from only agricultural lands
 - Soils data quality and APLE process
- No objections to AgWG Aug 24 recommendations
 - Crop removal, default credit stream exclusion, adjustments to soil P uncertainty, time-scale for future P scenarios

Water Quality GIT Conference Call September 11

- Matt Johnston, UMD, discussed [white paper](#) differentiating decision points between scenario years for planning targets and Phase III WIPs.
- Peter Claggett, USGS, presented
 - Briefing on 2025 growth projections
 - Update on the resolution to a turf grass classification error
 - over-classification of turf grass in some areas that are actually pasture, crop-land or mixed-open.

Results for Chesapeake Bay watershed

- 116,273 acres of Turf Grass (~ 4% of total)
- + 56,767 acres of Pasture
- + 37,069 acres of Cropland
- + 22,435 acres of Mixed Open

Jurisdiction	Total Turf Change	Jurisdiction's Turf
District of Columbia	0.01%	-0.1%
Delaware	1.2%	-3.3%
Maryland	16.8%	-3.0%
New York	2.1%	-1.4%
Pennsylvania	39.5%	-5.2%
Virginia	33.4%	- 4.3%
West Virginia	7.0%	- 7.8%

Management Board Meeting

September 21

Decisions Requested from WQGIT

1. Does the Management Board find that the following two concerns as designated by DNREC and DDA **meet the Partnership approved definition of a fatal flaw**?
 - a. **Inequity** between modeling soil data between the agricultural and urban sectors.
 - b. **Uncertainty and variability** of observed agricultural phosphorus soils data submitted by the jurisdictions.

2. Does the Management Board **agree to the following next steps** to resolve the concerns on soil phosphorus data?
 - a. Future Data Collection: **continue to collect soil phosphorus data** and submit that data to the Chesapeake Bay Program Office to inform two-year milestone development
 - b. STAC Workshop: initiate efforts to **convene a STAC workshop** to investigate the impact of soil phosphorus on urban runoff for future versions of the Partnership's modeling tools

3. Does the Management Board **approve the use of the APLE model** to simulate soil phosphorus in the Phase 6 Watershed Model?

Materials: [Soil Phosphorus Briefing Paper](#)

Water Quality GIT Face-to-Face Meeting September 25/26

- Select Agenda Items (Monday the 25th)
 - Phase 6 Model
 - Suite of Modeling Tools Presentation
 - 2017 Phase 6 model development
 - Key changes to the tools since 2011
 - Schedule for final calibration
 - Methodology and results of the geographic isolation runs
 - Establishing a Scenario Year for Phase III Planning Targets
 - Scenario results using 2010, 2013, 2017 and 2025 options
 - **Decision:** Selection of the scenario year for establishing the draft Phase III WIP planning targets.



https://media1.giphy.com/media/3o6Ei2yv8fqR3nJG8/200_s.gif