

CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM
WATER QUALITY GOAL IMPLEMENTATION TEAM
March 23, 2015 CONFERENCE CALL
Minutes

Summary of Action and Decision Items

ACTION: Please send comments on the proposed BMP Expert Panel Protocol revisions to Lucinda by April 30th.

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

Jenn Volk convened the call and verified call participants.

Agriculture Workgroup Update – John Rhoderick, AgWG Co-Chair

- John updated the WQGIT on [decisions and actions](#) from the March 18-19 Agriculture Workgroup (AgWG) meeting. He also reviewed the AgWG's agreed upon 2015 [workplan](#).

Discussion:

- James Davis-Martin (VA DEQ): Has the AgWG resolved the issue of determining the credit lifespans for practices?
 - Rhoderick: That effort isn't complete yet. We had recommendations but not consensus. That will be resolved in the next two weeks.
 - Emma Giese (CRC): The AgWG resolved about 90% of the credit lifespan issues, and they hope to have that finished in the next two weeks.
- Davis-Martin: Why are you selecting panel chairs prior to the panel member nomination process?
 - Rhoderick: The nominations for the overall panel is still subject to WQGIT approval, so even though the AgWG has selected panel chairs, they must still be approved at the goal team level.
- Jessica Blackburn (Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay): What is the date for the June AgWG meeting?
 - Giese: June 17-18. The meeting will most likely be in Virginia, but the exact location is yet to be determined.
 - Rhoderick: That is just the quarterly meeting, our next monthly conference call is April 16th.

Evaluating Changes in Water Quality from AGU – Jeni Keisman, USGS

- Jeni gave a [presentation](#) from the December 2014 American Geophysical Union meeting, which illustrates a conceptual approach for integrating multiple sources of information to investigate drivers of water quality changes.

Discussion:

- Dave Montali (WV DEP): Are the BMPs in the North Fork Shenandoah inclusive of manure transport?

- Keisman: We are trying to tease that out.
- Andy Zemba (PA DEP): It seems like the type of work you're doing is what the Chesapeake Bay Agreement envisioned for the water quality standards attainment and monitoring outcome. It should be captured in the management strategy.
 - Scott Phillips (USGS): You're right on. The STAR workplan for the Midpoint Assessment really is focused on achieving that monitoring assessment outcome, and this presentation is really at the heart of that workplan. We envision this information feeding back in and helping inform the jurisdictions as they develop their Phase III Watershed Implementation Plans (WIPs).
- Rhoderick: Is there additional data to be added so that all the data points are on a common timeline?
 - Keisman: Yes, we are working on extending those datasets through 2012. They are currently being updated.
- Matt Johnston (UMD): Do we know when the next version of SPARROW will be released?
 - Keisman: I don't have an estimated timeframe for that yet.
 - Phillips: Right now we are trying to use the current SPARROW model to help put some bounds on uncertainty estimates for the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Model, so I think it will be another year before we get the new version out.

BMP Expert Panel Protocol Revisions – Lucinda Power, EPA

- Lucinda provided an overview of the changes being proposed to the [BMP Protocol](#).
- Power: A few key points:
 - There will be the opportunity to have a more in-depth discussion on these proposed revisions during the April 13th WQGIT face-to-face meeting. Other Chesapeake Bay Program partners, such as CAC, STAC, and the Habitat GIT, have been invited to participate in this discussion on the 13th.
 - Please reach out to me if you would like to schedule a separate discussion to go through your comments, questions, or concerns.
 - All current language is subject to discussion and further modification.

ACTION: Please send comments on the proposed BMP Expert Panel Protocol revisions to Lucinda by April 30th.

Discussion:

- Rhoderick: Because we are usually looking at a suite of practices under one category, some experts may not have a good background in every practice. Sometimes it is hard to get expertise across a broad compendium. As long as that is recognized, I would appreciate it.
 - Power: I agree with that.
- Norm Goulet (NVRC): I'd suggest adding language that grandfathers in existing panels. My second request is to change to panel makeup. I think it is vital we have local partners that deal with the BMPs on the daily basis, such as local government workers, local extension agents, and local soil conservation district representatives. They deal with the practices and how to account and verify them, and we need to account for that.

- Power: Is there anything in the current language that would exclude those groups?
 - Goulet: No, but I think we need to call them out specifically.
 - Rhoderick: I disagree. On the front end of this process, there is a public forum for those local representatives to make sure the experts understand all of those practices. If they are experts, they are not excluded, but we should not have a placeholder just for a local government representative.
- Mary Gattis (LGAC): LGAC will likely be chiming in on the proposed protocol revisions and providing a similar recommendation on this same issue. What process should LGAC use to provide input on this?
 - Power: Submission of formal comments would be great. I have asked for them by April 30th. If you would like to attend the April meeting, it would be great to have LGAC represented. Are you looking to have an explicit mention of local government representation? I think it is up to the source sector workgroup or the Virginia Tech process to identify potential membership. I think we need to be careful about singling out particular groups and I don't think the current language excludes any particular group.
 - Volk: I don't think we should forget that we can have one person wear several hats. We can work on the wording of how to list that.
 - Gattis: I will follow up with you and we can talk about it. It was brought to my attention by one of our members. As long as the local implementer perspective is brought to bear in the discussion, that is what we are looking for.
- Davis-Martin: My concern is going back to the frequency of updates to this document. I don't think we have had a single panel go through this version of the BMP Expert Panel Protocol, and here we are already revising it. We are supposed to be evaluating what worked before we start changing it again. These revisions feel premature. I would like to see a completed Virginia Tech panel report and a completed non-Virginia Tech panel report that has been developed under this Protocol first.
- Power: I would just ask that if we are not going to consider any revisions, please let me know now before we get too far down this path. This was based upon partnership request.
- Davis-Martin: I would think more about our process for considering proposed revisions. I would rather have the issue be raised at the WQGIT and discuss it to determine if changes are really needed.
- Power: I think that is too late for this particular round, but is the membership in agreement on that new process moving forward?
- Volk: I really think the WQGIT does need to discuss the process for considering proposed BMP Protocol revisions, particularly how and when to make changes. We also need to have that discussion for other protocols such as making changes to the Watershed Model.
- Blackburn: What was the thinking behind the BMP Panel meetings being closed to the public?
 - Power: There was a lot of discussion last summer and the decision was to model the panels after the National Academy of Sciences. Because of the sensitive nature of some of the subject matter discussed in the panel, many experts have wanted a closed space to talk about their research, or issues that may not be in line with their organization's

- official stance. That is why we have the open stakeholder forum, and why we expect regular updates to the source sector workgroups.
- Johnston: As a coordinator of some of these panels in the past, I have never said no to a guest interested in participating in a panel call, and often they are close colleagues with very relevant information to offer. For me that has been very helpful.
 - Power: That is a really good point, Matt. We do list panel contacts, so if the public wants to know more, they have a point of contact to reach out to and get more information.

Adjourn

Next WQGIT Face-to-Face Meeting:

Monday, April 13, 2015

List of Call Participants

<u>Member Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
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
Jessica Blackburn	Alliance for the Chesapeake
Chris Pomeroy	Aqualaw
Seung Ah Byun	Brandywine Conservancy
Marel King	CBC
Sheryl Quinn	Dept. of the Navy
Mary Searing	DDOE
Sarah Sand	DDOE
John Schneider	DE DNREC
Bill Angstadt	DMAA
Gary Shenk	EPA
Suzanne Trevena	EPA
Dianne McNally	EPA
Lew Linker	EPA
Jeff Sweeney	EPA
Ann Carkhuff	EPA
Jennifer Sincock	EPA
Kristen Saacke-Blunk	Headwaters LLC
Mary Gattis	LGAC
John Rhoderick	MDA
Bruce Michael	MD DNR
Lee Curry	MDE
Dinorah Dalmasy	MDE
Norm Goulet	NVRC
Andy Zemba	PA DEP
Ted Tesler	PA DEP

Kristen Wolf	PA DEP
Ross Mandel	PRC
Kevin McGonigal	SRBC
Dave Haklar	SRBC
Matt Johnston	UMD
Sally Claggett	USFS
Jeni Keisman	USGS
Doug Moyer	USGS
Joel Blomquist	USGS
Scott Phillips	USGS
Chris Brosch	VA DCR
Carl Friedrichs	VIMS
Jeremy Hanson	VT, CBPO
Mindy Selman	WRI
Teresa Koon	WV DEP
Dave Montali	WV DEP
Jenny Tribo	