

CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM
WATER QUALITY GOAL IMPLEMENTATION TEAM
January 12, 2015 CONFERENCE CALL

SUMMARY OF ACTION AND DECISION ITEMS:

ACTION: WQGIT members should provide their feedback on the Midpoint Assessment's Project Plan to Lucinda Power (power.lucinda@epa.gov) by COB January 27.

DECISION: WQGIT approved the Agriculture Workgroup's proposed Phase 6.0 BMP Expert Panel process.

ACTION: Bill Stack and Jenn Volk will follow up with Chris Bauer and Carl Friedrichs to ensure that their concerns regarding the Shoreline Nutrient Management Panel report have been sufficiently addressed. The WQGIT will be asked to approve the report during their February 9th conference call.

DECISION: WQGIT members agreed to submit proposals for WIP assistance funding by February 13, 2015. Rich Batiuk will edit the guidance document to reflect the decision and redistribute it to the WQGIT.

ACTION: Lucinda Power will work with CBP's modeling team to draft and distribute a memo asking source sector workgroups to begin defining credit durations for existing BMPs.

MINUTES:

Welcome/Confirm Call Participants/Workgroup Updates – Jenn Volk, Chair

- Jenn convened the call and verified call participants.

Workgroup Updates

Land Use Workgroup

- The Land Use Workgroup will hold a face-to-face meeting on January 27th.
- They will be discussing next steps toward deciding the urban tree canopy, stream corridor, and other Phase 6.0 final land uses.
- The Land Use Workgroup will meet on the 4th Thursday of the month in 2015.

Agriculture Workgroup

- The Agriculture Workgroup held a conference call on January 8th to discuss the path forward for the Nutrient Management Expert Panel as well as the Phase 6.0 Expert Panels.
- The Nutrient Management Panel has been charged with conducting a short term re-evaluation that will separate the N and P benefits for Tier 2 and Tier 3 Nutrient Management, and will be providing revised recommendations in March 2015.
- The AgWG recommended that the proposed process for the Phase 6.0 panels be brought to the WQGIT for approval before moving forward.

Urban Stormwater Workgroup

- The Urban Stormwater Workgroup held a meeting on December 16th where they discussed the land use loading rate targets for Phase 6.0, and updating the MS4 overlays.
- USWG has a conference call scheduled on January 20th.

- They will be discussing a future STAC workshop on proprietary BMP testing in the Chesapeake Bay, and the Urban Tree Canopy Management Strategy.

Forestry Workgroup

- The FWG's next meeting will be a face-to-face on Wednesday, February 4th. The meeting's focus will be on the Urban Tree Canopy and Forest Buffer management strategies.

Toxics Workgroup

- The Toxic Contaminants Workgroup (TCW) has engaged a wide variety of diverse stakeholders in the two Toxic Contaminants outcomes and continues to work to develop a management strategy.
- Currently, the workgroup is organized into two subgroups: one to address policy and prevention and another to address research.
- The Policy and Prevention management strategy will primarily address PCBs.
- The Research management strategy will develop a research agenda to better understand and identify concerns related to degraded fish and wildlife health, the effects of mixture contaminant groups, inputs and sources of contaminants and stressors, and nutrient and sediment BMPs that have multiple benefits related to toxic contaminants.

Watershed Technical Workgroup

- The WTWG is continuing to work on historic data cleanup efforts, and is assisting the Bay watershed jurisdictions with 2014 progress runs.
- The WTWG will have their next meeting on February 5th to continue discussing historic data cleanup and to review the Algal Flow Ways Technology expert panel report.

Trading and Offsets Workgroup

- The TOWG met in December to discuss techniques for crediting conserved and forested lands.
- The TOWG will have their next meeting on January 21st to discuss the new Baseline Technical Memorandum.

Wastewater Treatment Workgroup

- The WWTWG will have their next meeting on February 3rd to discuss biosolids data and historic data cleanup. They will also decide whether or not to approve convening a panel to explore the nutrient benefits of peat-based onsite wastewater treatment systems.

Modeling Workgroup

- The Modeling Workgroup met in December to discuss the Lower Susquehanna River Watershed report, the Conowingo dam relicensing, and overview of evaluation and reporting time periods for the Bay TMDL. They also reviewed a Phase 6 watershed model development stoplight status slide.
- The Modeling Workgroup will have two modeling quarterly meetings in January. January 14 – 15 will be focused on the water quality sediment transport model, the updated CMAQ Air scenarios, and climate change impacts. January 28-29 will focus on Phase 6 watershed model and a review of priorities and status.

Midpoint Assessment Project Plan – Lucinda Power, EPA

- Lucinda Power and Aileen Molloy (TetraTech) led a demonstration of the Midpoint Assessment Project Plan developed by TetraTech to track the scheduling of and progress towards Midpoint Assessment goals and deadlines.

Discussion:

- Lucinda Power (EPA): Tasks and timelines for this tool were pulled from the detailed schedule that was developed following the October face-to-face meeting. It includes the 14 midpoint assessment priorities and all of their associated tasks. It also includes start and end dates and dependencies within the tasks. I want this to be useful particular to the priority leads. Everyone will have access to the project plan, and it will be available on a TetraTech-hosted website that will be presented to the WQGIT at our February meeting. TetraTech will have editor access to the site, and I will put out monthly calls for updates. Feedback should focus on whether or not we have identified all the tasks and dependencies, and whether the start and end dates are correct.
- James Davis-Martin (VA DEQ): When you send out the pdf version of this tool, can you expand the sections that are collapsed?
 - Power: Yes, I can do that.
- Andy Zemba (PA DEP): This tool looks useful and helpful.
- Dianne McNally (EPA): I agree. Once the tool is populated, will it show the critical path?
 - Power: Yes, that is the intent.
- Davis-Martin: Does it allow you to establish dependencies between different tasks or priorities?
 - Aileen Molloy (TetraTech): Yes, it does. It is flexible and we can set up dependencies however we need to.
- Jenn Volk (Chair, U of Delaware): Lucinda, are you specifically directing your call for feedback at certain people?
 - Power: I would like to request feedback from the entire WQGIT first, but I will send out a second email to priority leads in order to get more targeted feedback from them as well.

ACTION: WQGIT members should provide their feedback on the Midpoint Assessment's Project Plan to Lucinda Power (power.lucinda@epa.gov) by COB January 27.

Agriculture Workgroup Expert Panels – John Rhoderick, AgWG Chair

- John Rhoderick presented a proposed path forward for the Phase 6.0 BMP expert panels that has been developed by the AgWG leadership, based on the WQGIT BMP protocol.
- For more information, please see the proposed path forward [document](#).

Discussion:

- John Rhoderick (MDA): The January Agriculture Workgroup (AgWG) meeting was dedicated to working on how to proceed forward with getting BMP reviews done on our tight timeline. The AgWG leadership put this proposal together, but there were questions raised and we would like WQGIT input on the following:
 - 1) Does the AGWG have the authority to sunset the existing BMP expert panels and create new panels?
 - 2) Does this proposed process have to be blessed by the WQGIT, or can the AgWG move forward with this proposal?

- Davis-Martin: Did the scopes of the current panels include working on the Phase 6 Watershed Model?
 - Rhoderick: No. Since that time, the poultry litter subcommittee has been charged with working on Phase 6, but this proposed process refers specifically to the Nutrient Management panel, the Conservation Tillage panel, and the Cover Crops panel.
- Davis-Martin: If the panels finished their work for Phase 5.3.2, are we sure they have any work to do for Phase 6, or can the recommendations from Phase 5.3.2 also be applied to Phase 6?
 - Rhoderick: Some recommendations may carry over to Phase 6, but the AgWG leadership wanted to give panel members who are going to work on Phase 6 a very specific charge. There was some lack of direction in the past, and we want to clean that up.
- Marel King (CBC): Who decides who facilitates these BMP expert panels?
 - Power: The AgWG determines the BMP expert panels that will be undertaken, and I work with the coordinators to determine what resources they need. It is a partnership discussion.
- Zemba: TetraTech would draft the reports and would also serve as facilitators between the expert panel and the Bay Program partnership. Are those the changes for this proposal?
- Rhoderick: You are correct. The academic experts don't mind committing the time, but they don't understand all the protocols for the review and reporting process. TetraTech understands that piece and their involvement will save a lot of time and resources.
- Davis-Martin: Sunsetting panels that have already done literature reviews that may be applicable to both Phase 5.3.2 and Phase 6, and creating a new panel who may re-review the same literature seems like a waste of valuable time.
 - Rhoderick: We are going to put out planning subgroups, so that new panel members know exactly what their scope and charge is.
 - Volk: Literature review would not be part of the scope?
 - Rhoderick: Correct. New panel members would be able to look at what has already been prepared for them by previous panels or by TetraTech. TetraTech would find the appropriate literature and put it in front of the panelists so that they can focus their time on making the expert judgment calls.
- Volk: Which panels does your request refer to?
 - Rhoderick: We are only looking to sunset Nutrient Management, Cover Crop, and Conservation Tillage.
- Volk: Generally, when you are seeking to convene a new BMP panel, it is the process to go through the WQGIT. We can ask for approval to sunset and form new panels through this process. Are there concerns about using this process?
- McNally: This new process will not deviate from the protocol? So the proposed list of panelists will be seen by the WQGIT?
 - Power: This is definitely in-line with the protocol. The partnership will have the opportunity to review the scope and the proposed panel membership.
- Davis-Martin: I want to make sure the coordination piece is happening between the expert panels, the WTWG, the AgWG, and the modeling team. I see you have indicated representatives from those groups on the panel. We need to make sure we have procedures in place, and recognize that having one representative on the panel doesn't necessarily mean it is well coordinated with other groups.
- King: How will the panels be addressing verification?

- Rhoderick: That is why we are using TetraTech and Virginia Tech. We want to make sure we pull the verification aspects out of their recommendations, and those facilitators will help do that.

DECISION: WQGIT approved the Agriculture Workgroup's proposed Phase 6.0 BMP Expert Panel process.

"Insights Report" – Scott Phillips, USGS

- Scott Phillips reviewed the findings of the "New Insights" report recently released by UMCES, USGS, and the CBP monitoring team. The report summarizes major lessons learned from 40 studies across the watershed where there was implementation of BMPs and water-quality monitoring to document the response.
- For more information, please see Scott's [presentation](#).

Discussion:

- Zemba: We have been working with the Center for Nutrient Solutions on how to target our practices, so that is one way we might be able to use this info.
- Davis-Martin: I want to question the conclusion from the Pocomoke study regarding phosphorus. Every year if we are applying manure, we expect the phosphorus loads bound to the soil to increase. But if you remove all that manure and the load remains constant, then the conclusion should be the soil still has the capacity to retain manure because you are not seeing a reduction from taking that manure off the landscape.
 - Scott Phillips (USGS): That would be another way to characterize that.
- Davis-Martin: If the soil is already saturated and you continue to apply manure, then you would expect the phosphorus loads to be higher. So is this a situation where the data can tell you whatever you want it to? It seems to contradict your conclusion.
 - Phillips: When the study started, they were hoping to see a reduction, but I see your point. If you look at the Choptank where you are still seeing increases, it might be a stronger case.
 - Dave Montali (WV DEP): You also don't know where that trend line would have gone if you did not start moving manure out.
- Volk: Please reach out to Scott if you have more questions.

Shoreline Management BMP Panel Report – Bill Stack, CWP

- Bill Stack presented the Shoreline Management BMP Expert Panel report.
- For more information, please see Bill's [presentation](#) or the [panel report](#).

Discussion:

- Davis-Martin: I thought the second dissenting opinion was in regards to bulkheads, not armoring?
 - Stack: Yes, you are correct.
- McNally: Given the fact that the WQGIT just received this report on January 8th, and the protocol states we must have 10 business days for review, can we postpone a decision?
 - Volk: I don't think timing is critical at this point, so we could defer a decision until the next call.

- McNally: So you were previously using the stream restoration rate, but now the default is still the stream restoration rate?
 - Stack: In a sense, yes. The current process is to use the stream restoration rate, regardless of the type of practice. So we were asked to come up with a default rate for only those practices that are historical or non-conforming, and the data could not be collected that would determine whether or not they fall within these other recommendations. We couldn't find anything in the literature to justify a different default rate for the non-conforming practices, so we decided to go back to the default rates the current protocol is using, with the modification that the percentage of sand within the practices would be removed from credit.
- McNally: So we are going to approve 137 lbs/ln ft/yr for MD and 84 lbs/ln ft/yr for VA in place of 2 lbs/ln ft/yr?
 - Stack: Yes, we felt this is really the best we can do at this time.
- Volk: We also received an email from Chris Bauer (USACE) and Carl Friedrichs (VIMS) reiterating the dissenting opinions. Do you want to address those, Bill?
 - Stack: Chris' concerns were the same ones echoed by the WTWG regarding how volatile or reactive nutrients are with these sediments. His recommendation was because of that issue and the sand content, the whole report should be shelved. His concern, however, is really with the nutrients and we feel we have addressed that.
 - Volk: We will follow up with him and make sure we have addressed his concerns.
 - Stack: Yes, I will follow up with Chris.

ACTION: Bill Stack and Jenn Volk will follow up with Chris Bauer and Carl Friedrichs to ensure that their concerns regarding the Shoreline Nutrient Management Panel report have been sufficiently addressed. The WQGIT will be asked to approve the report during their February 9th conference call.

- Davis-Martin: I have concerns about the precedent we are setting with this BMP by not crediting coarse sediments. We have other BMPs that are crediting coarse sediments, such as street sweeping. Think about what that means for our other BMPs, or come up with a good reason why this is distinctly different.

2015 WIP Assistance Funding Process – Rich Batiuk, EPA

- Rich Batiuk briefed members on the four specific sets of financial and technical support resources available to jurisdictional partners to help support their ongoing efforts to enhance and document their BMP verification programs and conduct their historical BMP data clean-up.
- For more information, please see the jurisdictions funding opportunities [draft document](#).

Discussion:

- Rich Batiuk (EPA): What is a reasonable date to submit proposals for WIP assistance funds?
 - Zemba: Pennsylvania will be able to meet January 30th deadline. If it is pushed back, could we submit it early and get feedback?
 - Batiuk: We'd like it to all come in together so that everyone gets a fair shot at receiving funding.
- Ben Sears (NYSDEC): How about February 13th?

- Batiuk: I am comfortable with that if you all want to wait that long.
- Davis-Martin: Would these funds be added to some reprogram of existing work plans?
 - Batiuk: Yes, if you said you wanted to apply it to a particular mechanism, we will work with you on that.
- Davis-Martin: I am fine with the February 13th deadline. Our most recent work plan did include an element for both BMP verification and historic data cleanup. Will we be given the opportunity to seek this as alternate funding for this work?
 - Batiuk: Yes, you can do that.
- Sears: New York would like at least 30 days to submit a proposal.
- Volk: Is there agreement to change Rich's deadline for submitting proposals for WIP assistance funds to February 13th?
 - No one opposed. Date for submittal changed to February 13th.
- Batiuk: I will get everyone the revised language on the Virginia Tech (VT) agreement for RFPs. The last funding option is EPA's agreement with TetraTech. If you are interested in using this vehicle, write up a technical directive, and work with Lucinda to figure out a means for doing so if it fits under the scope of the contract. All funds are focused on historic data cleanup and BMP verification plans. These options will be revised based on comments received today and I will redistribute them in the next 2 days.
- Jeremy Hanson (VT): Would you want VT proposals to follow the same February 13th deadline?
 - Batiuk: Yes.

DECISION: WQGIT members agreed to submit proposals for WIP assistance funding by February 13, 2015. Rich Batiuk will edit the proposal to reflect the decision and redistribute it to the WQGIT.

Face-to-Face Meeting Follow-up – James Davis-Martin, Vice-Chair

- James Davis-Martin updated the WQGIT on the progress of action and decision items made during the October Face-to-Face meeting.
- For more information, please see the [summary document](#).

Discussion:

- Davis-Martin: Can we send a workshop proposal to STAC to figure out what questions we need to address as part of an uncertainty analysis? Thoughts on an approach to that?
 - Phillips: I think that is a good idea.
 - Lee Currey (MDE): Yes, the Modeling workgroup can help put together a proposal.
- Davis-Martin: Scott Phillips, Lee Currey and I can work to put together that proposal, which is due on February 11.
- Davis-Martin: Have source sector workgroups taken up working on defining credit durations for existing practices?
 - Norm Goulet (NVRC): No, I haven't received any communications on the subject.

ACTION: Lucinda Power will work with CBP's modeling team to draft and distribute a memo asking source sector workgroups to begin working to define credit durations for existing BMPs.

Adjourn

Next WQGIT Conference Call:

Monday, February 9, 2015

1:30-3:30pm

List of Call Participants

Member Name	Affiliation
Jenn Volk (Chair)	U of Delaware
James Davis-Martin (Vice-Chair)	VA DEQ
Lucinda Power (Coordinator)	EPA, CBPO
David Wood (Staff)	CRC
Emma Giese (Staff)	CRC
Bill Stack	CWP
Marel King	CBC
Beth McGee	CBF
Mary Searing	DDOE
Marty Hurd	DDOE
Kim Snell-Zarcone	Conservation PA
John Schneider	DE DNREC
Ann Baldwin	DE DNREC
Sheryl Quinn	Dept. of Navy
Neely Law	CWP
Suzanne Trevena	EPA
Dianne McNally	EPA
Julie Winters	EPA
Lew Linker	EPA
Ann Carkhuff	EPA
Rich Batiuk	EPA
Jeff Sweeney	EPA
Ruth Izraeli	EPA
Chris Day	EPA
Jenny Tribo	
Jamie Mitchell	HRSD
Ross Mandel	ICPRB
John Rhoderick	MDA
Jason Keppler	MDA
Dinorah Dalmasy	MDE
Lee Curry	MDE
Tom Thornton	MDE
Marya Levelev	MDE
Karl Berger	MWCOG
Norm Goulet	NVRC
Ben Sears	NYSDEC
Andy Zemba	PA DEP
Kristin Wolf	PA DEP
Ted Tesler	PA DEP
Kevin McGonigal	SRBC

Eric Aschenbach
Aileen Molloy
Scott Phillips
Lisa Ochsenhirt
Jeremy Hanson
Alana Hartman
Teresa Koon
Dave Montali

VA Dept. of Health
TetraTech
USGS
V(M) AMWA
VT, CBPO
WV DEP
WV DEP
WV DEP