

Water Quality Goal Implementation Team

December 14-15 Face to Face Meeting

SUMMARY OF ACTIONS & DECISIONS

Day 1

Clarifying Decision Roles: Who, What & When?

ACTION: WQGIT members to mark-up the list of decision points over the course of the meeting and be sure that this listing fully reflects how we are proceeding forward as a partnership over the coming weeks and months. The list of decision points will continue to be updated overtime and Lucinda Power will distributed the updates to the WQGIT accordingly.

Phase 6 Modeling Tools – 2016 Review

ACTION: WQGIT members should let the Modeling Workgroup know the scale at which they would like to see the model input data and scenario output data. Please direct your requested scale, type of model data, inputs and outputs to Lewis Linker, CBP Modeling Coordinator.

ACTION: The Modeling Workgroup co-chairs will work directly with the CBPO Modeling Team to draft and present, to the WQGIT in January 2016, a comprehensive list of the model outputs (inputs, rates, calibration results, initial scenario results, etc.) the partners can expect to have direct access to with the delivery of each new Beta version of the partnership's Phase 6 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Model and decision support tools.

ACTION: The Modeling Workgroup co-chairs and coordinator will work with the WQGIT Chair, Vice Chair and coordinator to lay out a more detailed schedule and process for carrying out the reviews of the partnership's suite of models, with a focus on providing clear direction to the WQGIT's workgroups on their roles and responsibilities in this review process. This proposed, more detailed model review schedule and process will be presented to the WQGIT in January 2016. The Modeling Workgroup will work with each of the WQGIT's workgroups on explaining any significant changes the Modeling Workgroup has observed and where each workgroup should focus their own reviews. Roles and decision responsibilities will be clearly identified in the Phase 6 Model documentation.

DECISION: The WQGIT agreed with the Modeling Workgroup's presented recommended approach, schedule, and process for undertaking the year-long review of the partnership's suite of modeling and supporting tools under the Midpoint Assessment, factoring in the agreed to follow-up actions and discussions by the WQGIT.

Land Use 6.0

ACTION: CBPO Modeling Team and CBPO Land Use Data Team will work together to determine the feasibility and benefits for incorporation of Phase 6 land use data, as it is finalized, into the forthcoming Beta 2 and Beta 3 versions of the Phase 6 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Model.

ACTION: WQGIT members will determine if they can provide in-house GIS staff resources to help in the processing of the high resolution land cover and the local land use data into the Phase 6 land use data set. If so, WQGIT members should work directly with Peter Claggett, CBP Land Use Workgroup coordinator, to make the necessary arrangements to provide that staff support.

DECISION: The WQGIT agreed with the Land Use Workgroup's presented recommended approach, schedule, and process for the development and review of the Phase 6 land use data, factoring in the agreed to follow-up actions and discussions by the WQGIT.

Inclusion of New BMPs & Scenario Builder Data Elements

ACTION: By March 1st, WQGIT members and WQGIT workgroups need to tell Curt Dell, Agriculture Modeling Subcommittee (AMS) chair, if they have specific issues/topics for discussion and resolution by the AMS that must be addressed prior to the April 1, 2016 deadline to provide the AMS' Beta 2 version Phase 6 Watershed Model recommendations to the Agriculture Workgroup for their decisions.

ACTION: WQGIT members were asked to identify a staff member in each state and the District to take the lead for their jurisdiction in reviewing the Scenario Builder outputs and documentation starting in early January 2016.

ACTION: CBPO staff will develop a list of the BMP expert panels that are organized based on the significance of their impact on the development of the Phase 6 modeling tools. Separately, they will develop a realistic schedule for the delivery of the panels' final reports to ensure that the dates are aligned with the 2016 decision points schedule. These products will be presented to the WQGIT in January 2016 to inform a discussion of resource availability and prioritization of work.

DECISION: The WQGIT agreed with the Agriculture Modeling Subcommittee's presented recommended approach, schedule, and process for carrying out its assigned responsibilities under the Midpoint Assessment, factoring in the above agreed to actions and discussions, with a recognition of what the AMS is and is not planning to review.

Historical BMP Data Cleanup

ACTION: WQGIT members are strongly encouraged to start the process now of reviewing the wealth of information on state-specific historical BMP data, as well as Scenario Builder input data rather than waiting until the release of the Beta 1 version of the Phase 6 Watershed Model at the end of December 2015. These data were posted on each of the states' password

protected modeling web pages in November 2015. Please contact Jeff Sweeney if you need access to these web pages.

ACTION: EPA will send Virginia Department of Environmental Quality an email asking Virginia to proceed forward with factoring the NRCS cost share data into their historical BMP data record, recognizing that Virginia still can't access the point data and use it to eliminate any double counting of co-cost shared practices. EPA will recognize that taking this action goes against the partnership's agreed to basinwide BMP verification principles and protocols. When Virginia is able to sign a 1619 data sharing agreement with USDA, Virginia will take the necessary steps to resolve any double counting situations.

ACTION: Starting in January 2016, the Watershed Technical Workgroup will schedule briefings for each of the source sector and habitat workgroups—Agriculture, Forestry, Streams, Urban Stormwater, Wastewater and Wetlands—to walk them through the current status of the jurisdictions' historical BMP data clean ups.

DECISION: The WQGIT agreed with the Watershed Technical Workgroup's presented recommended approach, schedule, and process for continuing to work with each of the jurisdictions' on their ongoing historical BMP data cleanups, factoring in the agreed to follow-up actions and discussions by the WQGIT.

Climate Change – Wetland Loss, Sea Level Rise and Temperature Rise

ACTION: Zoe Johnson, CBP Climate Change Coordinator, and Lewis Linker, CBP Modeling Coordinator, will work with the Climate Change and Modeling Workgroups on developing a more detailed schedule for undertaking the necessary climate change analyses leading up to the decisions by the partnership on how to factor in the impacts of climate change and factor this schedule into the WQGIT's overarching Midpoint Assessment decision points schedule.

Wrap Up Phase 6 Discussion

ACTION: In early 2016, the Agriculture Modeling Subcommittee will provide more information to the WQGIT on how the various nutrient sources, such as nitrogen residuals and mineralization, are factored into the nutrient availability to crops in the Phase 6 Watershed Model.

Nutrient Management 5.3.2 Task Force: Review and Approval of Cross Walk

ACTION: The Nutrient Management Task Force will provide the WQGIT with an updated cross-walk table that includes the acres submitted under each tier of Nutrient Management, once that data is available.

ACTION: The WQGIT will take the results of the Nutrient Management Task Force crosswalk to the Management Board in January 2016. They will summarize that there is discomfort with the

potential ways in which the results of the crosswalk will be used but will not make a formal recommendation.

Post-Meeting Update:

During their December 17th meeting, the AGWG all agreed to stay the course and finish the work it has started. Their decision will be recorded in the meeting summary, and next steps are listed below:

1. December: States submit final crosswalks to the Task Force – both narrative submissions and acres. Task Force finalizes crosswalk report. TF is focused on:
 - a. WV documentation to support its reported acres. We think WV has the supporting information, they just need to be willing to share it.
 - b. DE resubmission of its crosswalk. DE is working on other “lines of evidence” for a resubmission of the crosswalk. We remain concerned about whether DE will have sufficient information to back up its reported acres. Secretary Kee linked into the meeting via phone but remained silent. Chris Brosch, DDA, said he said the main problem is that the TF doesn’t understand DE’s programs and asked to give a presentation to the AGWG instead of providing more information in the crosswalk. The AgWG Chairs said they need the crosswalk, but also welcome state program presentations throughout this coming year.
 - c. PA and NY – we’ll want more information to justify the high compliance levels reported.
 - d. Tier 2 P justification – the Task Force needs to spend some more time evaluating state documentation on compliance levels.
2. January: Make any necessary adjustments to the state-reported acres.
 - a. EPA will finalize and implement a methodology for adjusting any state-reported acres, if states are unable to provide sufficient documentation or adjust state-reported acres downward.
 - b. EPA will continue to work with the Ag Workgroup as it develops and implements its methodology.
3. February: States will work with CBPO modelers to finalize NEIEN data submissions to ensure consistency with crosswalks. Reported acres should be equivalent to the compliance acres.
4. Post-February: CBPO modelers will conduct the 2015 progress run.

Day 2

Measuring and Explaining Trends in Water Quality

ACTION: USGS will work directly with the WQGIT on the roll-out of their small watershed studies report in 2016, with a focus on getting agreement on the key messages coming out of the detailed analyses.

ACTION: USGS will work with the WQGIT to set up a group of technical staff drawn from the WQGIT agencies and organizations to work directly with the Explaining Trends team to work out more detailed responses to the three sets of questions (and others) posed to the WQGIT.

ACTION: USGS will work with the WQGIT to convene a group of managers to develop the bigger picture trends and explanation storylines and how we need to communicate what over what timeframe in terms of trends and their explanations. Charge this group to then work directly with the WQGIT's identified technical group and the Explaining Trends team.

ACTION: USGS will work with the WQGIT chair, vice chair, and coordinator to schedule a series of webinars over the coming year to present the increasing level of information and understanding coming forward from the work underway within the Integrated Trend Analysis Team's work on explaining trends up in the watershed, in the Bay's tidal waters and the connections between both.

ACTION: The WQGIT will determine how to best work with the Explaining Trends team to further flesh out the more watershed and stations specific explanation of trends—do we organize and work at a state by state scale, specific watersheds (e.g., Susquehanna), specific regions (e.g., Delmarva), or all three as we go deeper into the explanation of the observed trends.

Phase III WIP Stakeholder Assessment Final Report and Action Plan

DECISION: The WQGIT accepted the final Phase III WIP Stakeholder Assessment Report on behalf of the larger CBP partnership.

ACTION: Lucinda Power will work with WQGIT members on drafting up a proposed charge and schedule for convening an ad-hoc Task Force with cross-sector representation that will frame out the options for a WQGIT recommendation regarding the development of local area targets for the Phase III WIPs. That charge and timeline will be presented to the WQGIT in January 2016.

ACTION: WQGIT members should send comments on the draft Stakeholder Assessment Action Plan to Lucinda Power by January 21, 2016. In response, Lucinda will work with the Action Team to respond to any comments received, as well as to address the concerns expressed during the WQGIT meeting on the need for the Action Plan to speak to all 9 findings from the Stakeholder Assessment Report.

Phase III Planning Target Methodology

DECISION: WQGIT agreed to proceed with the current principles for setting planning targets as a framework and to, over the course of 2016, work towards an incremental understanding of how the forthcoming new models and inputs will affect the existing allocation methodology.

ACTION: The WQGIT identified changes to the No Action and E3 scenarios to reflect new information, past assumptions and new BMPs, and the effects of Conowingo Dam, climate change, and James River chlorophyll a criteria re-evaluation as areas where more information will be needed in order to determine whether or not changes to the three principles and the underlying methodology are needed.

ACTION: The WQGIT will target June 2016 to make a recommendation to the Management Board and Principals' Staff Committee, with that date subject to change.

Options for Partnership Policy on Updating Information in Two-Year Milestones

DECISION: The WQGIT agreed, starting with the jurisdictions' development of their 2017 milestones, that the partnership will hold the assumptions set at the beginning of the milestone period constant over the two year period. Land uses will be projected at the beginning of the milestone period, and those projections will not be changed, though the land uses will change annually based upon those projections. At the end of the milestone period, the partners will factor in the new information, BMP efficiencies, and data previously approved by the partnership into the present and past history of progress runs, back through 2009. With the introduction of new BMPs, the jurisdictions can go back and update their past reporting for those new BMPs over the course of past history of progress runs conducted after the end of the Phase 6 Watershed Model calibration period.

ACTION: The WQGIT chair will take the WQGIT decision on a partnership policy for updating new information to the Management Board in January 2016 for their information and to seek their concurrence that they are comfortable with this policy moving forward into the 2017 milestone development process.

2025 Forecasted Conditions in Phase III WIPs

ACTION: The WQGIT agreed to participate in a cross-GIT group, led by Peter Claggett and Mark Bryer and building from the Land Use Workgroup membership, and representatives from Water Quality, Habitat, Healthy Watershed, and Stewardship GITs. The charge of this cross-GIT group is to develop recommendations on how the partnership could proceed forward with crediting conservation as a means of avoiding future growth in loads.

DECISION: The WQGIT agreed to the Land Use Workgroup proceeding with the recommended approach of reviewing and approving the forecasting methodology in order to provide the GIT

with the information needed to make a decision regarding whether or not to plan Phase III WIPs on 2025 forecasted conditions in the May 2016 timeframe.

Wrap Up

DECISION: The WQGIT confirmed James Davis-Martin (VA DEQ) as their new chair and Teresa Koon (WV DEP) as their new vice-chair. The WQGIT's confirmation of the new chair will be submitted to the Management Board for their approval in January 2016.