

CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM

WATER QUALITY GOAL IMPLEMENTATION TEAM

August 13, 2018 CALL SUMMARY

Meeting Materials: [Link](#)

Summary of Actions and Decisions:

Action: Tanya Spano, Dianne McNally, and Matt Johnston will assist Lucinda Power in review of proposals for NFWF Small Watershed grants and Innovative Nutrient and Sediment grants. All reviews should be completed by September 24.

Action: Lucinda Power will work with CBPO staff to develop guidance for jurisdictional local planning goal presentations to the PSC. This guidance will include considerations for time constraints in presentations to the PSC, and example templates.

Decision: the WQGIT approved the Conservation Landscaping Practice as an interim BMP in Phase 6 CAST. Credit for Conservation Landscaping Practices will be available in the current Phase 6 CAST as a planning BMP, and will be available as an official BMP in the modeling tools after the end of the two-year lockdown period in fall 2019.

Decision/Action: The proposed boat pump-out practice was not approved for interim BMP status at this time. The WWTWG will address the comments received and will refine the boat pump out practice recommendations to include commercial type I and II manure sanitation devices.

Decision: The WQGIT approved the Onsite Wastewater Treatment practice for drip dispersal as an interim BMP in Phase 6 CAST. The new OSWT practice will be available in the current Phase 6 CAST as a planning BMP, and will be available as an official BMP in the modeling tools after the end of the two-year lockdown period in fall 2019.

Decision: The WQGIT approved the denitrifying bioreactors practice as an interim BMP in Phase 6 CAST. The new denitrifying bioreactors practice will be available in the current Phase 6 CAST as a planning BMP, and will be available as an official BMP in the modeling tools after the end of the two-year lockdown period in fall 2019.

Decision: The WQGIT approved the saturated buffers practice as an interim BMP in Phase 6 CAST. The new saturated buffers practice will be available in the current Phase 6 CAST as a planning BMP, and will be available as an official BMP in the modeling tools after the end of the two-year lockdown period in fall 2019.

Actions:

- WQGIT members and interested parties are asked to provide feedback and comments on draft revisions to the management strategy and workplan for the 2017 WIPs and 2025 WIPs

to Michelle Williams (williams.michelle@epa.gov) and Allie Wagner (wagner.alexandra@epa.gov), no later than **COB September 4.**

- Comments on the workplan and management strategy related to Standards, Attainment, and Monitoring should be sent to Peter Tango (ptango@usgs.gov), no later than **COB September 4.**
- Comments and feedback on the draft revisions to the Forest Buffers management strategy and workplan should be sent to Sally Claggett (sclaggett@usfs.gov), no later than **COB September 4.**
- Comments and feedback on the draft revisions to the Toxic Contaminants Policy and Prevention management strategy and workplan should be sent to Michelle Williams (williams.michelle@epa.gov) and Greg Allen (allen.greg@epa.gov) no later than **COB September 4.**
- Comments and feedback on the draft revisions to the Toxic Contaminants Research management strategy and workplan should be sent to Emily Majcher (emajcher@usgs.gov) and Scott Phillips (swphilli@usgs.gov), no later than **COB September 4.**

1:00 Welcome/Confirm Call Participants/Workgroup Updates –WQGIT Co-Chairs

Announcements:

- EPA's Midpoint Assessment of the 60% by 2017 goal towards the Chesapeake Bay TMDL is available [here](#).
- STAC request for information on Phase III Planning efforts, challenges and opportunities. Jurisdictional feedback requested to Dinorah Dalmasy by COB August 31, including questions and requests for STAC to address science question.
 - Tanya Spano asked if other members other than jurisdictional representatives can send in challenges and questions for STAC.
 - James Davis Martin indicated that this should be OK.
 - Rachel Dixon: We are open to feedback from anyone, we are just reaching out to the WQGIT to channel this input. Anyone with these kinds of questions and needs should also reach out to Dinorah to take to the September STAC meeting.
- Announcement and Request for non-jurisdictional GIT membership volunteers to review NFWF grant proposals (Small Watershed grants, Innovative Nutrient and Sediment Reduction grants)—Lucinda Power, EPA CBPO
 - Lucinda Power: all reviews should be in by September 24. We usually get around 30 proposals assigned to review at the WQGIT. This year includes emphasis on regional approaches to implementation. We will get instructions from NFWF, and you should plan to spend around 2-4 hours per proposal, and no more than 10 hours total for each volunteer.
 - Tanya Spano tentatively volunteered.
 - Dianne McNally volunteered.
 - Matt Johnston volunteered.

Action: Tanya Spano, Dianne McNally, and Matt Johnston will assist Lucinda Power in review of proposals for NFWF Small Watershed grants and Innovative Nutrient and Sediment grants. All reviews should be completed by September 24.

- Climate change narratives for Phase III WIPs. There will be a concurrent review between WQGIT and CRWG and MB for this narrative.
 - Jennifer Dopkowski: There will be debrief from SRS tomorrow, they want the WQGIT and MB to review and provide comments by September 4 meeting, and MB to discuss at September 13 meeting. I will share with WQGIT and MB this week for feedback.
 - James Davis-Martin: This is from the climate SRS process, similar to what the WQGIT is doing now for SRS.
- Power: As per the EPA expectations document, jurisdictions should be presenting local planning goal approaches to PSC in fall PSC meeting (date TBD, likely in October timeframe). We want to see if it might be useful for jurisdictional members to preview their PSC approaches to local planning goals at our September WQGIT meeting. Would the jurisdictional members like to do this preview at our September 10 or September 24 WQGIT call?
 - Nicki Kasi: We have a Phase III WIP steering committee for September 10.
 - Davis-Martin: I am also only available September 24th. Does the Management Board want to see any of this prior to the PSC meeting?
 - Power: We may have to do a second GIT call in September and a similar preview to the Management Board shortly before or after. We will plan for those presentations on September 24 for the WQGIT.
 - James Davis-Martin requested guidance be sent to the jurisdictions on the time constraints and considerations for presenting to the PSC.
 - Lucinda will work with CBPO to get guidance out and a standard format.
 - Nicki Kasi asked for a standard or example also be sent out.

Action: Lucinda Power will work with CBPO staff to develop guidance for jurisdictional local planning goal presentations to the PSC. This guidance will include considerations for time constraints in presentations to the PSC, and example templates.

1:10 Overview of Interim BMPs – Matt Johnson, UMD

Matt reviewed the difference between interim BMPs and official BMPs, interim BMP uses and applications, and the relationship of interim BMP approval to the PSC-approved stopping rule to stabilize Phase 6 modeling tool updates.

Discussion:

- By April 30, 2019, all BMPs have to be approved in order to make it for progress reporting in 2019. Interim BMPS can be used for planning purposes, and that process is ongoing from now until the end of WIP development. Those can be used in

implementation plans but will not be available for progress until the full panel process has concluded. We don't have a schedule for all the CAST releases between now and the end of WIP development, but we will have rolling timelines which will update Phase 6 CAST with interim BMPs.

- Marcia Degen: The Onsite Wastewater Treatment (OSWT) BMP has been approved by a panel, and has a report and technical appendix that was approved by the WWTWG, the WTWG, and presented to the WQGIT. All we have missed is the deadline for the official BMPs.
 - Matt Johnston: We have to make it a BMP for the planning process and interim, but once the next milestone period occurs, we can include that as an official BMP in April 2019 to include by October 2019. It would not be available for progress this year (2018) but will be available for the 2019 milestones and 2019 progress onward.
- James Davis-Martin asked if there is a third category of BMP, to differentiate between approved BMPs that are pending inclusion in the modeling tools at the next milestone update, as opposed to BMPs that have not completed the panel process and may change or still be interim at the 2019 model update.
 - Johnston: We don't have an official designation for that, but that is a good suggestion. That's a good way to separate those categories.
 - Marcia Degen concurred.
- Sarah Diebel: Is there a process published for laying out the steps for a new BMP to take shape, from the point it's introduced to the point where it is approved for an official BMP?
 - Johnston: We have a BMP protocol that lays out that process, and now we have the added complication of timing for the Phase III WIP development and the model update process. We don't have a clear protocol to distinguish between those interim and official BMPs.
 - Power: The entire process from beginning to end is available in the BMP protocol, which can be accessed on our website. Later, once everyone is familiar with that protocol, perhaps we could open that document for updates. However, the 2015 update to the protocol took at least a year, so the next update may also take some time.
- Diebel: Is there a current list of interim BMPS?
 - Matt Johnston: That list is on CAST with distinctions between official and interim, and when you build a scenario, those BMPs are selectable by official versus planning BMPs.
- Sarah Diebel asked about the schedule for approving and formalizing interim BMPS.
 - Johnston: Each interim BMP will work its way up through that whole process, so we can't say with certainty which BMPs will be up for approval exactly when. However, we will put together a CAST release schedule, and that will have new interim BMPs in them as the rolling updates occur.
- Dianne McNally: What's the risk of approving an interim BMP that then does not get approved or has substantial changes when it becomes official?

- Johnston: It's possible that an interim BMP is suggested and approved, but does not get approved as an official BMP, so there is a risk to the jurisdiction using that BMP that the BMP may not be approved and may not be available later for progress reporting. So that goes back to the suggestion of differentiating between BMPs that will definitely be approved next milestone period vs BMPs that do not yet have panels approved or reports done. We can come up with a third name for those soon-to-be official BMPs.
- Goulet: I would like to caution that it is a fairly frequent occurrence that interim BMPs often have changes to their removal efficiencies once they complete the panel and approval process to become official. That can lead to some heartburn for states that plan on using these interim BMPs—especially when those numbers decrease.
- Montali: What is the target date for the model updates after the lock-down? What happens if it is approved for progress within the milestone period?
 - Power: It will not be available for progress reporting in 2018 since the model is locked down during that time. There is a schedule for data input deadlines to structure that two-year lockdown period for when we expect to receive and incorporate data updates into the development of the 2019 modeling tools. We think April 2019 is enough time to target that new CAST development and data input deadlines. We want source sector input in the draft schedule first, but we can make that draft schedule available before it is approved by the source sector workgroups.
- Montali: When are the milestone periods?
 - Davis-Martin: We are currently in the 2018-2019 milestones, which were developed in 2017. The next milestones will be drafted in 2019 for 2020-2021.
 - Montali: So if BMPs are approved in 2019, those can be used for 2021 milestones.
- Johnston: To clarify, this is a small subset of the total number of BMPs available.
- Spano: I think we need to form a schedule for these inputs and approval dates for the model updates, and I want to re-iterate the need for the schedule to be available for us to refer to.
 - Johnston: Good suggestions. Thanks.

1:25 Conservation Landscaping Practices –Tom Schueler, CSN

Tom briefed the WQGIT on the proposal for homeowner conservation landscaping practices as an interim BMP, including WTWG- and WQGIT-approved revised interim nutrient reduction credits.

Decision Requested: WQGIT decision on whether to approve conservation landscaping practices as an interim BMP.

Discussion:

- Tom Schueler: This practice is small scale, but is popular in the homeowner BMP category. This was approved by the USWG and WTWG, and was brought to the WQGIT in July and was approved as TIB status (Temporary interim BMP status). WTWG

recommended that the removal rate should be reduced by 50% from the original N and P reductions to be conservative until or unless more accurate data comes forward in finalizing the BMP for progress and milestones reporting.

- Davis-Martin: Your category means it will soon become permanent, or that it will never be permanent because there is no expert panel?
 - Schueler: This will become final without an expert panel. The USWG used the protocol provisions that allow practices to be interpreted in the context of existing BMPs, so no expert panel was needed.
- James Davis-Martin called for approval of this BMP. This will be in the model for planning purposes until September 2019 and then will become permanent and allowable for progress reporting.
- McNally: The WQGIT has already approved this for use, and this will be an interim BMP until April 2019. Do we need to approve it again when the lockdown period is over?
 - Davis-Martin: We are approving the final BMP for now, and then it will be included in the model after the lockdown period.
 - Diebel: We wanted to reduce the efficiencies by half from what was in the original document--why? Is that because we needed additional information and this was to err on the side of caution?
 - Goulet: The WTWG felt that it was better to err on the side of caution for planning purposes. It's possible that these efficiencies will be revisited in the future before 2019 in the fall. We have a deadline now to get this BMP in before the end of August, so we felt this was the best estimate we could agree on in the limited time we have.
 - Davis-Martin: If we approve this today for planning purposes, what happens to this BMP in 2019 to finalize it?
 - Goulet: We will try to address VA's comments on the efficiencies, and if we can address those concerns or if new understandings of those efficiencies is uncovered before April 2019, then we will adjust those interim efficiencies to reflect that new understanding when this is approved for an official BMP.
 - Power: This can be approved today as interim efficiencies, although this number might be revised if it actually goes through a BMP panel. If the partnership approves this as a final BMP without the expert panel process, but this will be added into the model as an official process.
 - Schueler: We went through a process to interpret this practice in terms of other existing practices, which is an available path laid out in the BMP protocol.
 - Power: it's different if we approve of this practice and allow it to go through an alternative process to an expert panel, which is a available in the protocol. Then this will be considered a pending or interim-official and will be included in 2019 as an official practice.
- Montali: If this is approved, the numbers will be 39% and 25% removal for nitrogen and phosphorus, respectively, due to the WTWG recommendation to cut the efficiencies in half for conservative estimates. So the efficiencies presented today will be the official

efficiencies at the official inclusion in 2019, unless new information comes to light to change that efficiency.

- Spano: If numbers change, all BMPs have to come back for those revisions processes and provide some justification for adjusting the efficiencies.
- Montali: Clarification that this BMP is being approved officially, not as interim, but official pending the next update of the modeling tools.
- Goulet: We will update the removal efficiencies table to be more clear about the 50% reduction in removal efficiencies.

Decision: The WQGIT approved the Conservation Landscaping Practice as an interim BMP in Phase 6 CAST. Credit for Conservation Landscaping Practices will be available in the current Phase 6 CAST as a planning BMP, and will be available as an official BMP in the modeling tools after the end of the two-year lockdown period in fall 2019.

1:40 Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems – Marcia Degen, VDH, and Vic D’Amato, TetraTech

Marcia Degen and Vic D’Amato briefed the WQGIT on the Expert Panel recommendations and technical appendix for drip irrigation dispersal practices for onsite wastewater treatment practices as an interim BMP.

Decision Requested: WQGIT decision on whether to approve onsite wastewater drip dispersal treatment practices as an interim BMP.

- Degen: We want to add a new soil dispersal component to the existing septic practices. This has gone through the WTWG, WWTWG, and has been presented to the WQGIT at the [June 11](#) and [July 23](#) conference calls. This has gone through the panel process, has a report and a technical appendix.
- No questions; BMP was approved.

Decision: The WQGIT approved the Onsite Wastewater Treatment practice for drip dispersal as an interim BMP in Phase 6 CAST. The new OSWT practice will be available in the current Phase 6 CAST as a planning BMP, and will be available as an official BMP in the modeling tools after the end of the two-year lockdown period in fall 2019.

1:55 Boat Pump-Out Practices –Vic D’Amato, TetraTech

Vic D’Amato briefed the WQGIT on the Expert Panel recommendations and technical appendix for boat pump-out practices as an interim BMP. Comments on the proposed Boat Pump-out interim practice were requested and compiled into an additional appendix to the Boat Pump-Out report.

Decision Requested: WQGIT decision on whether to approve boat pump-out practices for interim BMP.

Discussion

- Vic D'Amato reviewed the comments received on the Boat Pump-Out report. Comments have been compiled into an appendix, available on today's calendar page.
- D'Amato: We are out of resources in the contract and cannot reconvene the panel to address comments at this time. If the WQGIT is interested in moving ahead with reconvening panel or other work to complete BMP report and technical appendix, need to identify resources, leads, and plan to complete practice by April 2019 for inclusion in next update to Phase 6 model.
- Goulet: I don't want to degrade your work, but I see a lot of holes in this report and while there may be a very narrow practice that can be salvaged out of this, I don't see this as a viable practice as it is described now (see Norm Goulet's comments in Appendix I)
- James Davis-Martin noted several concerns on behalf of VA. VA thinks that the proposed interim practice would have to be very limited in order to be approved by VA. Concerns include language that runs counter to guidance in the BMP protocol, crediting at point of pump-out, not county or jurisdiction, and baseline load calculations, etc. (see full VA DEQ comments in [appendix I](#)). If the panel has been disbanded, then we're not sure how these comments can be addressed moving forward.
- D'Amato: I don't know if the panel has been officially disbanded, it's just not active and the contract to coordinate the panel is out of resources. It was hard to get the panel together for meetings, and there is not a lot of panel representation today.
- Linker: It could be DEQ's opinion that if there is a no-discharge zone (NDZ), and if there was a strict accounting of marine sanitation devices (MSDs) on type I and II, then DEQ could consider approval, and then only credit the specific site where pump out is occurring rather than the jurisdiction where the facility is located. Only then, could DEQ consider this practice under those narrow conditions.
 - Davis-Martin: That is correct.
- McNally: Comments were also discussed at the WQGIT [July 23 call](#). We want to make sure the reductions are avoiding double counting. We also don't know how you could credit an MS4 for this practice. If we talk about an NDZ, then any discharge is already illegal, so we can't credit that since illegal discharges aren't part of the waste-load allocation of the TMDL.
 - Goulet: Type I and II (MSDs) are legal to discharge (commercial vessels?). For type III (recreational vessels?), it is illegal to discharge in that three-mile zone. We can see something being used from this report, but that will be an extremely narrow process.
 - Davis-Martin: We can remove that stipulation for an NDZ—DEQ would be ok with this practice anywhere where discharges are legal.
 - Vic D'Amato addressed Dianne's comment on crediting MS4s. For example, the Lynnhaven River jurisdiction was requesting credit under their MS4 program, which may be why that is mentioned in the report. I understand the double-counting concern, although I'm not sure how this practice would address that issue.

- Linker: We do have an accounting of WWTP dischargers, and those are counted as close to the NPDES permit reporting as we can get. Boat discharges that are collected and treated at WWTPs are included in that load. We have that load already, and that is not double-counting if we are discussing type I and type II vessels, since those loads are discharged directly overboard.
 - Davis-Martin: That would be parallel with a septic tank pump-out, since septic tank loads are trucked to WWTPs, but we still give credit to septic practices for a load that is treated at a wastewater facility.
 - Linker: There are rules and procedures on type I and type II while they are in the NDZ.
 - Davis-Martin: While they are in the NDZ. And we know those NDZs tend to be relatively small, so while a vessel may be in a NDZ in a small creek or tributary or in the shallows, they could leave the NDZ and still be in the open Bay where they can legally discharge.
 - Linker: That is consistent with the DEQ suggestion to only focus on type I and type II pump-outs, only accounting for pump-outs at the pump-out station, and crediting jurisdictions only where the pump-out occurs.
- Spano: There are a lot of mechanical questions over what to credit and how much can be covered under this practice. There is a need to narrow our scope with this practice. It went to the WWTWG and the WTWG, and this scope seems like a bit more than the WWTWG was able to discuss. I think the WWTWG can revisit some of this based on the charge from today's meeting. These seem like more substantive issues that can't be worked through in a month and brought back, however—we will need some more sustained time to work through these concerns.
- Goulet: It can't come back next month if you wanted to—August is the deadline to include planning BMPs.
- Power: To clarify Norm's comment: we would like to update the schedule for interim BMPs, and we may move to a rolling basis rather than have a final deadline at the end of August. We may replace that deadline with as-requested rather than have a single deadline. If the expanded analysis from this discussion results in an interim BMP recommendation before April 2019, it can be brought back for approval due to the rolling deadline. To be included in the modeling tools as an official BMP, it needs to be approved by April 2019.
 - Davis-Martin: Good point. Also note that draft WIPs are due in June 2019 and not April 2019, due to the PSC planning targets approval in June.
- Linker: I agree with Tanya, these are deeper issues that need some more sustained work to investigate the implications of this potential practice. It would be useful to see this work move forward to completion.
- Spano: We can quantify some load, but we think that this BMP does not have enough data to quantify the baseline load that is currently estimated. Perhaps there is a narrower scope where we can quantify a load reduction based on the available data, and add some more components to this practice.

- Goulet: I think the method used originally is pretty inaccurate, but I think we can quantify a load reduction if not an actual baseline load.
- Spano: The WWTWG may be able to work on limiting the practice considerations now to better estimate the credit and practice proposal.
- Linker: We have an estimate now for the holding tank practice, but it seems that the real desire of the WQGIT is for the type I and II (larger vessels, tug boats, ferries, passenger boats, freighters, etc). The most useful expansion of this practice should probably target those Type I and II vessels.
- Tanya Spano volunteered to re-open the Boat Pump-Out discussion within the WWTWG.
- Davis-Martin: Does the WQGIT believe that this should go forward as a planning practice at this time?
 - Several objections were heard from the WQGIT membership.
- Davis-Martin: This report will go back to the WWTWG for additional analysis to refine this practice and the load reduction estimates.
 - No objections were heard from the WQGIT membership.

Decision/Action: The proposed boat pump-out practice was not approved for interim BMP status at this time. The WWTWG will address the comments received and will refine the boat pump out practice recommendations to include commercial type I and II marine sanitation devices.

2:20 Denitrifying Bioreactors and Saturated Buffers in Tile Drainage Areas –Loretta Collins, UMD

Loretta briefed the WQGIT on the Expert Panel recommendations and technical appendix for agricultural ditch bioreactors as an interim BMP. Loretta briefed the WQGIT on the Expert Panel recommendations and technical appendix for saturated buffers as an interim BMP.

Decision Requested: WQGIT decision on whether to approve the Saturated Buffers in Tile Drainage Agricultural Areas practice as an interim BMP.

Decision Requested: WQGIT decision on whether to approve agricultural ditch bioreactors as an interim BMP.

- Davis-Martin: These will be interim practices, and will be replaced upon approval of the full report later this year. The panel will provide recommendations on a full suite of ditch practices but saturated buffers and bioreactors are two individual practices from that group which are further towards completion than the other practices.
- Chris Brosch: Motion to approve. Lindsay Thompson seconded.

Decision: The WQGIT approved the denitrifying bioreactors practice as an interim BMP in Phase 6 CAST. The new denitrifying bioreactors practice will be available in the current Phase 6

CAST as a planning BMP, and will be available as an official BMP in the modeling tools after the end of the two-year lockdown period in fall 2019.

Decision: The WQGIT approved saturated buffers in tile drainage areas as an interim BMP in Phase 6 CAST. The new saturated buffers practice will be available in the current Phase 6 CAST as a planning BMP, and will be available as an official BMP in the modeling tools after the end of the two-year lockdown period in fall 2019.

2:50 Revisions to Water Quality Management Strategies and Two-Year Workplans

Draft revisions to management strategies and workplans are available for public review and comment. Final management strategies and workplans will be submitted to Chesapeake Progress by September 13.

2:50 – 3:15 WQGIT Discussion of Management Strategy and workplan revisions for 2017/2025 WIPs, and Water Quality Standards, Attainment and Monitoring outcomes – Michelle Williams, CRC, Allie Wagner, CRC, and Peter Tango, USGS

- Peter Tango: We have two new factors for monitoring that were presented at the SRS progress presentation. One was supporting new data streams, and the other was modeling and monitoring comparisons. We want to make sure that those two items are referenced in the management strategy, in the context of the resources available to sustain our current and growing monitoring networks.
- Nicki Kasi: I think these strategies are supposed to stay static and not change very much. Can we remove the state-specific actions under Current Efforts? I don't know that we'd have anything yet since the Phase III WIPs are not yet written.
- Kasi: I think the strategy should include more general information about the Phase III WIPs rather than what each state is doing.
 - James Davis-Martin agreed: the strategy should be more general. We ask the WQGIT to take a look through the documents provided
- Power: Note that this is a WQGIT management strategy, and not a CBPO management strategy. These are for the 2025 Phase III WIPs, so we do want to be referencing those specific documents in this document. Please let us know what you'd like to remove or change and provide some justification for that change in the management strategy.
- Kristin Saunders: We have discussed taking this more high level and long term for the management strategies. Many other GITs and workgroups have opted to remove jurisdiction-specific actions and strategies, and focusing more on programmatic and Partnership-based actions over the next two years.
- Power: If any members have any questions, Carin Bisland and Dave Goshorn are the mentors for the WQGIT SRS process, and if you would like, we can
- Saunders: The logic table becomes the template for the workplan moving forward, and this is all based on the adaptive management cycle.
- Dianne McNally: If I remember from the preparations for the May meeting, We have to come up with actions for the WQGIT to focus on to get us to the 2025 WIPs. Is that list

of priorities something that we need to consider and expand on? For instance, if we know we're behind in nitrogen and phosphorus

- Davis-Martin: We could write a strategy that includes an adaptive management strategy, and that would not change very much as we move forward. We want to make sure the management strategy reflects what the WQGIT wants their long-term focus to be, and the logic table should focus on what we want our work over the next two years to be.
- Michelle Williams: We are asking the group to review the whole management strategies and logic tables in the next two weeks, but if you have limited time, please do a quick overview, and focus on the last sections where guiding questions and management approaches are listed for the next two years.
- Dianne McNally asked what the plan is to submit and compile comments for the WQGIT September 10 call.
 - Williams: our plan to collect comments from now until September 4, and compile them into a draft final document to show at the WQGIT September 10 call. That draft final will be a last check before it is submitted on the September 13 deadline.
- Claggett: For forest buffers, we had collected initial comments and overall ideas before our Management Board meeting in May, and then we've spent the last few months working through all those comments and making small tweaks, while showing draft versions for public comment.

3:15 – 3:30 Updates on Forest Buffers Management Strategy and Workplan Revisions
 – Sally Claggett, USFS

- Sally Claggett presented the updated logic table and workplan for Riparian Forest Buffers. The Management Strategy will come out later this week. The Management Board has also convened a forest buffer action team that has met several times. Some of these actions detailed in the workplan have been taken on by that action team.
- Davis-Martin: The logic table identifies factors and gaps, and then highlights actions in the workplan that will achieve that outcome and address that factor/gap.
 - Claggett: Yes. There might be a step in between. The categories on the left side of the logic table are the factors (from STAR). The middle column identifies what actions are essential to address this factor. The third column is the gaps, that identify what we need more of to achieve our goal. Our management strategy has not changed very much, so most of the focuses are in updating our workplan.

3:30 – 3:45 Updates on Toxic Contaminants Policy and Prevention Management Strategy and Workplan Revisions –Greg Allen, EPA CBPO

- Greg Allen out; Michelle Williams reviewed major changes to the Policy and Prevention Management Strategy: Exploration of the PCB Consortium, and policy and prevention for PAHs. We are also looking at reformatting the science approaches in the workplan.

3:45 – 4:00 Updates on Toxic Contaminants Research Management Strategy and workplan revisions –Scott Phillips, USGS

- Scott Phillips gave an overview of the research management strategy and workplan updates. Especially, looking for input from the source sector workgroups, given main pathways of toxic contaminants in the watershed. Other questions for review might include the potential contaminants of emerging concern, and WQGIT weigh-in on that. Includes toxins from harmful algal blooms (HABs), road salts, and per-flouro-alkyl substances (PFAS).
- Davis-Martin: Your workplan includes more jurisdiction-specific elements, and not so many workgroup-specific items. Isn't that something that the partnership is trying to move away from, and towards work that the workgroup as a unit is working on?
 - Phillips: We did not know that, and we will take another look at the workplan with that perspective.
- Spano: There are some cross-sector projects now happening for the WWTWG and Toxic Contaminants Workgroup, on PCB concentrations following WWTP enhanced nutrient removal upgrades (ENR). I do think that road salts and HABs are important local issues, so I think there is local concern there around those issues. I would note that WWTPs are not the original source of these contaminants. If we don't get at the source of these contaminants, vs looking at the conveyance of wastewater, then we won't solve the issue. These are issues that are holistic and affect drinking water supply.
- Davis-Martin: Are PAHs related to the recent GIT project proposal to develop a sealant certification program in DC?
 - Phillips: That is in a new management approach for Policy and Prevention, to include regulation and management of PAHs, since the research is more established on those contaminants.
- Spano: PAHs are also a high priority for local jurisdictions.

Actions:

- WQGIT members and interested parties are asked to provide feedback and comments on draft revisions to the management strategy and workplan for the 2017 WIPs and 2025 WIPs to Michelle Williams (williams.michelle@epa.gov) and Allie Wagner (wagner.alexandra@epa.gov), no later than **COB September 4.**
- Comments on the workplan and management strategy related to Standards, Attainment, and Monitoring should be sent to Peter Tango (ptango@usgs.gov), no later than **COB September 4.**
- Comments and feedback on the draft revisions to the Forest Buffers management strategy and workplan should be sent to Sally Claggett (sclaggett@usfs.gov), no later than **COB September 4.**
- Comments and feedback on the draft revisions to the Toxic Contaminants Policy and Prevention management strategy and workplan should be sent to Michelle Williams (williams.michelle@epa.gov) and Greg Allen (allen.greg@epa.gov) no later than **COB September 4.**
- Comments and feedback on the draft revisions to the Toxic Contaminants Research management strategy and workplan should be sent to Emily Majcher (emajcher@usgs.gov) and Scott Phillips (swphilli@usgs.gov), no later than **COB September 4.**

4:00 Adjourned

Call Participants:

Rachel Dixon , STAC
Mary Gattis, LGAC
Dave Montali, TetraTech
Loretta Collins, UMD
Jeremy Hanson, VT
Lucinda Power, EPA CBPO
Sally Claggett, USFS/Forestry Workgroup Coordinator
Karl Berger, MWCOG/LUWG Chair
Norm Goulet, NoVA Regional Commission/USWG Chair
Tom Schueler, CSN/USWG Coordinator
Tanya Spano, MSWCOG/WWTWG chair
Matt Johnston, UMD
Kelly Gable, EPA Region III
Emily Trentacoste, EPA CBPO
Peter Tango, USGS/STAR Coordinator
Mackenzie Bodman, CRC
Joan Smedinghoff, Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay
Kristin Saunders, UMCES/Cross-GIT Coordinator
Bruce Michael, MDNR
Emily Dekar, USC
Vic Damato, TetraTech
Amanda Albright, HRSD
Adrienne Kotula, CBC
Beth McGee, CBF
Cassandra Davis, NYS DEC
Chris Brosch, DE DDA
Dianne McNally, EPA Region III
Ed Dunne, DC DOEE
Gary Shenk, USGS
George Onyullo, DC DOEE
James Davis Martin, VA DEQ/WQGIT Co-Chair
Jeff White, MDE
Jenn Volk, UD
KC Filipino, HRSD
Lauren Townley, NYS DEC
Marel King, CBC
Lew Linker, EPA CBPO
Lindsay Thompson, MDAG
Marcia Fox, DNREC
Neely Law, CWP
Nicki Kasi, PA DEP

Olivia Devereux, Devereux Consulting
Ruth Izraeli, EPA Region III
Suzanne Trevena, EPA Region III
Ted Tesler, PA DEP/WTWG Chair
Teresa Koon, WV DEP
Vic D'Amato, TetraTech
Scott Phillips, USGS/TCW Vice-Chair