

CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM  
WATER QUALITY GOAL IMPLEMENTATION TEAM  
MAY 23<sup>RD</sup>, 2011 CONFERENCE CALL MINUTES

## SUMMARY OF DECISION AND ACTION ITEMS

- Jurisdictions will provide their milestone data to EPA by June 1<sup>st</sup>.
- Comments on Russ's BMP review protocol for BMPs proposed by outside entity due to Russ by noon on May 31<sup>st</sup>.
- The WQGIT will have an additional conference call on June 27<sup>th</sup>.
- Phase 5.3.2 Nutrient Application Updates
  - Any additional questions, comments on nutrient application on non-NM lands should be sent to Larry Merrill by May 31<sup>st</sup>.
  - EPA will produce a memo summarizing the nutrient application issue for the Agricultural Workgroup to review at their upcoming conference call.
- The WQGIT did not object to the proposal to change two of the atmospheric deposition credit decision rules.
- Peter Tango and Rich Batiuk will work with Grants Team about match requirements and options for the non-tidal monitoring network proposal and distribute the final proposal for WQGIT approval at its 6/13 conference call prior to going to the Management Board.

## MINUTES

### UPDATES

**ACTION:** Jurisdictions will provide their milestone data to EPA by June 1<sup>st</sup>.

**ACTION:** Comments on Russ's BMP review protocol for BMPs proposed by outside entity due to Russ by noon on May 31<sup>st</sup>.

#### *Phase 5.3.2 Nutrient Application Updates*

- Due to a miscommunication between the modelers and the Agricultural Workgroup the difference between nutrient application to nutrient management and non-nutrient management land was not as large as the workgroup wanted and on May 9th Agriculture Workgroup Meeting they recommended a halt to calibration of the model to increase nutrient application to non-nutrient management acre receiving only inorganic fertilizer.
- The Agriculture Workgroup shared this recommendation with the WQGIT on its May 9 call.
- Preliminary analysis indicates that the difference between what the AgWG and WQGIT approved in January and the recommendation on May 9 would not change the model outcomes enough to affect management strategies to reduce loads from agricultural lands.
- Dr. Frank Coale, Chairperson of the Ag WG, stated that the thorough review of the Phase 5.3.2 model and the resulting suggestions for future model updates is evidence of a healthy adaptive management process for ongoing improvement.
- Dr. Coale expressed that the updates to the models are moving in the right direction. Dr. Coale explained that although additional modifications are necessary, Phase 5.3.2 does a better job than Phase 5.3.0 to characterize the differences in nutrient application rates between acres with and without NM plans. Dr. Coale acknowledged that EPA indicated some of these modifications may not be possible until the next round of model updates in advance of the Phase III WIPs.
- Kenn Pattison and Bill Keeling reiterated their concerns with the misunderstanding as per their comments on the May 9<sup>th</sup> Agricultural Workgroup meeting.
- Rich Eskin suggested that it be considered if the issue could be addressed as part of the 2013 progress evaluation.

- Pat Buckley suggested that the correction be made now and the schedule extended accordingly so that the states still had the same amount of time between receiving the updated numbers and submitting their draft and final Phase II WIPs. She indicated that her PSC member did not approve the Phase II WIP schedule and end date. Rather, PA's position is that any delays in the model updates should be accompanied by similar extensions to the schedule.

**ACTION:** Any additional questions, comments on nutrient management should be sent to Larry Merrill by May 31<sup>st</sup>.

**ACTION:** EPA will produce a memo summarizing the nutrient application issue for the Agricultural Workgroup to review at their upcoming conference call.

### **UPDATE ON CALIBRATION OF THE WATERSHED MODEL – LEWIS LINKER**

- Bill Keeling and Arthur Butt expressed concern with the decreasing accuracy of the model and differences in the calibration at the small geographical and temporal scale.

### **CREDITING A NEW OZONE STANDARD IN PHASE II WIPs – LEWIS LINKER**

- Kenn Pattison was concerned about using the 1% credit which he felt worked for forest, but not necessarily non-forest land.

### **REFINEMENTS TO THE AIR CREDIT DECISION RULES – LEWIS LINKER**

**DECISION:** The WQGIT did not object to the proposal to change two of the atmospheric deposition credit decision rules. (See link above for full description of existing rules and changes.)

### **NON-TIDAL MONITORING NETWORK UPDATE – PETER TANGO, KATIE FOREMAN**

- Currently there are 88 sites throughout watershed measuring nutrient and sediment monthly to determine trends and status throughout watershed.
- Review in 2009 with STAC and the Monitoring and Realignment Process has coinciding with recommendations on how this network could be used for the TMDL.
- Sites will improve assessment of changes in major source sectors, small watersheds, watersheds with a large degree of BMP implementation, and will provide data in areas lacking monitoring to improve future calibration of the CBP model (i.e. Coastal Plain)
- Jurisdictions have provided feedback but any additional comments are welcome.
- New funding through EPA in 2011 budget and existing funding for the network maintenance, match requirement is 5% match
- Ron Entringer was concerned about required match funding.
- Bruce Michael asked if funding is strictly designated for additional sites or if it would fund historic long term sites that funding is being lost for.
- Pennsylvania was concerned about having enough staff hours to do the necessary analysis and wanted to know if the funds would be used to pay staff.

**ACTION:** Peter Tango and Rich Batiuk will work with Grants Team about match requirements and options for the non-tidal monitoring network proposal and distribute the final proposal for WQGIT approval at its 6/13 conference call prior to going to the Management Board.

### **OTHER**

Pat Buckley questioned if the NEIEN average or median average was preferable for the milestone data and Katherine Antos said that median is generally preferable and it should be fine to use unless the state is informed otherwise.

## PARTICIPANTS

Larry Merrill, Chair	EPA	<a href="mailto:merrill.larry@epa.gov">merrill.larry@epa.gov</a>
Katherine Antos, Coordinator	EPA CBPO	<a href="mailto:antos.katherine@epa.gov">antos.katherine@epa.gov</a>
Rich Batiuk	EPA CBPO	<a href="mailto:batiuk.richard@epa.gov">batiuk.richard@epa.gov</a>
Russ Baxter	VA DEQ	<a href="mailto:russ.baxter@deq.virginia.gov">russ.baxter@deq.virginia.gov</a>
Gopal Bhatt	PSU/CBPO	<a href="mailto:gbhatt@chesapeakebay.net">gbhatt@chesapeakebay.net</a>
Karl Blankenship	Bay Journal	<a href="mailto:bayjournal@earthlink.net">bayjournal@earthlink.net</a>
Chris Brosch	UMD/CBPO	<a href="mailto:cbrosch@chesapeakebay.net">cbrosch@chesapeakebay.net</a>
Pat Buckley	PA DEP	<a href="mailto:pbuckley@state.pa.us">pbuckley@state.pa.us</a>
Arthur Butt	VA DEQ	<a href="mailto:ajbutt@deq.virginia.gov">ajbutt@deq.virginia.gov</a>
Ann Carkhuff	EPA	<a href="mailto:carkhuff.ann@epa.gov">carkhuff.ann@epa.gov</a>
Frank Coale	UMD	<a href="mailto:fjcoale@umd.edu">fjcoale@umd.edu</a>
Lee Currey	MDE	<a href="mailto:lcurrey@mde.state.md.us">lcurrey@mde.state.md.us</a>
Chris Day	EPA R3	<a href="mailto:day.christopher@epa.gov">day.christopher@epa.gov</a>
Rusty Diamond	PA DEP	<a href="mailto:rdiamond@state.pa.us">rdiamond@state.pa.us</a>
Jim Edwards	EPA CBPO	<a href="mailto:edward.james@epamail.epa.gov">edward.james@epamail.epa.gov</a>
Ron Entringer	NY DEC	<a href="mailto:raentrin@gw.dec.state.ny.us">raentrin@gw.dec.state.ny.us</a>
Rich Eskin	MDE	<a href="mailto:reskin@mde.state.md.us">reskin@mde.state.md.us</a>
Kelly Gable	EPA R3	<a href="mailto:gable.kelly@epa.gov">gable.kelly@epa.gov</a>
Norm Goulet	NVRC	<a href="mailto:ngoulet@novaregion.org">ngoulet@novaregion.org</a>
Will Hunley	HRSD	<a href="mailto:whunley@hrsd.com">whunley@hrsd.com</a>
Ruth Izraeli	EPA R2	<a href="mailto:izraeli.ruth@epa.gov">izraeli.ruth@epa.gov</a>
Bill Keeling	VA DCR	<a href="mailto:william.keeling@dcr.virginia.gov">william.keeling@dcr.virginia.gov</a>
Victoria Kilbert	CRC/CBPO	<a href="mailto:vkilbert@chesapeakebay.net">vkilbert@chesapeakebay.net</a>
Teresa Koon	WV DEP	<a href="mailto:teresa.m.koon@wv.gov">teresa.m.koon@wv.gov</a>
Jacqueline Lendrum	NY DEC	<a href="mailto:jmlendru@gw.dec.state.ny.us">jmlendru@gw.dec.state.ny.us</a>
Lewis Linker	EPA CBPO	<a href="mailto:linker.lewis@epa.gov">linker.lewis@epa.gov</a>
Kevin McGonigal	SRBC	<a href="mailto:kmcgonigal@srbc.net">kmcgonigal@srbc.net</a>
Bruce Michael	MD DNR	<a href="mailto:bmichael@dnr.state.md.us">bmichael@dnr.state.md.us</a>
Dave Montali	WV DEP	<a href="mailto:david.a.montali@wv.gov">david.a.montali@wv.gov</a>
George Onyullo	DC DOE	<a href="mailto:george.onyullo@dc.gov">george.onyullo@dc.gov</a>
Kenn Pattison	PA DEP	<a href="mailto:kpattison@state.pa.us">kpattison@state.pa.us</a>
Russ Perkinson	VA DCR	<a href="mailto:russ.perkinson@dcr.virginia.gov">russ.perkinson@dcr.virginia.gov</a>
Marel Raub	CBC	<a href="mailto:mraub@chesbay.us">mraub@chesbay.us</a>
Sucharith Ravi	UMCES/CBPO	<a href="mailto:sravi@chesapeakebay.net">sravi@chesapeakebay.net</a>
Aaron Ristow	USC NY	<a href="mailto:aaron.ristow@cortlandswcd.org">aaron.ristow@cortlandswcd.org</a>
Sarah Sand	DDOE	<a href="mailto:sarah.sand@dc.gov">sarah.sand@dc.gov</a>
John Schneider	DE DNREC	<a href="mailto:john.schneider@state.de.us">john.schneider@state.de.us</a>
Helen Stewart	MD DNR	<a href="mailto:hstewart@dnr.state.md.us">hstewart@dnr.state.md.us</a>
Rachel Streusand	CRC/CBP	<a href="mailto:rstreusa@chesapeakebay.net">rstreusa@chesapeakebay.net</a>
Gwen Supplee	EPA	<a href="mailto:supplee.gwendolyn@epa.gov">supplee.gwendolyn@epa.gov</a>
Jeff Sweeney	UMCP/CBPO	<a href="mailto:jsweeney@chesapeakebay.net">jsweeney@chesapeakebay.net</a>
Peter Tango	USGS/CBPO	<a href="mailto:ptango@chesapeakebay.net">ptango@chesapeakebay.net</a>
Tom Thornton	MDE	<a href="mailto:tthornton@mde.state.md.us">tthornton@mde.state.md.us</a>