

**CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM**  
**WATER QUALITY GOAL IMPLEMENTATION TEAM**  
May 23, 2016 CONFERENCE CALL  
**Meeting Minutes**

Summary of Action and Decision Items

ACTION: Peter Claggett will provide PA DEP with the parcels of lands in Pennsylvania that would be classified using the fractional land use method.

DECISION: The WQGIT approved the proposed fractional land use methodology that will be used to help classify barren and herbaceous lands in the Phase 6 Watershed Model.

ACTION: Peter Claggett will provide an update to the WQGIT once the fractional land use percentages have been finalized by the Land Use Workgroup. Peter will also provide an update to the Federal Facilities Workgroup.

Welcome/Confirm Call Participants/Workgroup Updates – James Davis-Martin, Chair

- James provided a recap of the May 19<sup>th</sup> Management Board (MB) meeting:
  - The Street Sweeping and Storm Drain Cleaning BMP expert panel report was approved as proposed by the panel, without inclusion of the Virginia DEQ's mass loading proposal. The MB allowed for the possibility of Virginia pursuing the mass loading approach further, assuming they can work through the remaining objections and receive approval of that approach by the Urban Stormwater Workgroup.
  - A few revisions were made to the BMP policy issues memo. Lucinda will revise the memo to reflect the MB feedback, then it will be distributed for a two week MB review. Final approval will be requested during the June MB conference call. In the meantime, the partnership is moving forward with convening a policy group of water quality, habitat and fisheries GIT members as well as MB members, to discuss policy issues related to the oyster BMP expert panel. Peyton Robertson (Chair of the Fisheries GIT, NOAA) is leading the group.
    - Sector workgroups would have the lead for convening a group to assess BMP policy issues, unless they are issues that cut across GITs and source sectors. An additional procedure was requested whereby if there is not a timely resolution of a policy issue, it would elevate to the next highest decision-making body earlier, even if the intent is still to resolve them at a lower level.
  - A memo to WQGIT and its workgroups was discussed. The intent is to remind everyone of the time constraints in completing the expert panel review process and to encourage everyone to provide comments and concerns on panel reports during the 30 day comment period.
  - The MB opted to forego the four alternative schedules we recommended for adjusting the Midpoint Assessment and Phase III WIP timeline and instead

develop a schedule of their own. That schedule is similar to our four alternatives. It will be distributed to the WQGIT and is being presented to the Principals' Staff Committee for their approval during their May meeting.

### Fractional Land Use Model – Peter Claggett, USGS

Peter provided information on the extent of the watershed to which the fractional land use method would apply, and reviewed the recommendations of the Land Use Workgroup and Urban Stormwater Workgroup.

### **Discussion:**

- Sarah Diebel (DOD): What fractional breakdown was proposed by Maryland?
  - Claggett: They proposed 30% mixed open and 70% turf grass. For the grouping of land uses in blue, we were thinking classifying barren lands as impervious and herbaceous lands as mixed open.
- Dave Montali (WV DEP): Would transitional fit into construction?
  - Claggett: Construction is not a land use class in the Phase 6 Watershed Model. Data on construction acres will be provided separately, where available, and we will have a separate rule for how to map those acres to Phase 6 land uses.
- Davis-Martin: A reminder that the alternative to the fractional land use method is to lump all of these barren and herbaceous lands into 100% turf. We need to make the decision one way or the other.
- Davis-Martin: Is there anyone who feels that we are better off calling barren and herbaceous parcels 100% turf grass as opposed to some percentage of fractional land use?
  - Tanya Spano (MWCOC): I would say I support Peter's recommendation. I just ask that this be made transparent so the public understands that these rules exist and at the scale at which they exist. Please make sure the context is provided that it is not necessarily accurate at a really local scale.
- Ted Tesler (PA DEP): How are you defining the road right of ways?
  - Claggett: It is a variable buffer by road type. The road data set has attributes for the type of road, number of lanes, speed limits and engineering guides for how wide those right of ways should be. Our analysts then came up with a variable buffer width based upon those factors. It is not a huge buffer.
- Tesler: The Urban Stormwater Workgroup came up with the idea that those road right of ways were fertilized?
  - Claggett: No, the decision was based more on the fact that road right of ways are heavily compacted and therefore generate a lot of runoff. They don't act like the more natural land use classes.
- Montali: Is there any difference in the right of ways within and outside of developed areas?
  - Claggett: They are all the same, but only the barren and herbaceous parts. If it is a road through a forest, none of it gets called turf.

- Tesler: Pennsylvania agrees that the fractional approach is better than the alternative. We are in the middle of the consensus continuum. Please provide us with parcels in Pennsylvania that we could analyze, similar to the effort Jeff White has done in Maryland.
  - Claggett: I will work with you on that.

ACTION: Peter Claggett will provide PA DEP with the parcels of lands in Pennsylvania that would be classified using the fractional land use method.

- Diebel: Are there land use definitions available to help everyone understand the difference between turf and barren or low vegetation?
  - Claggett: Yes. On the Land Use Workgroup website, there are documents from last year with these definitions. We are also working on a revised listing we can send in a week or two when it is done. We are elaborating on the shorter definitions from last year.
- Davis-Martin: Are there any other questions or concerns?
  - None were raised.
- Davis-Martin: Can everyone live with using the fractional land use methodology to classify barren and herbaceous lands in the Phase 6 Watershed Model?
  - No objections were raised.

DECISION: The WQGIT approved the proposed fractional land use methodology that will be used to help classify barren and herbaceous lands in the Phase 6 Watershed Model.

ACTION: Peter Claggett will provide an update to the WGQIT once the fractional land use percentages have been finalized by the Land Use Workgroup. Peter will also provide an update to the Federal Facilities Workgroup.

- George Onyullo (DOEE): When do you expect the land use data from federal facilities?
  - Claggett: It should be finished some time over the summer.

## Adjourn

## List of Call Participants

<b>Member Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
James Davis-Martin (Chair)	VA DEQ
Teresa Koon (Vice-Chair)	WV DEP
Lucinda Power (Coordinator)	EPA
David Wood (Staff)	CRC
Lindsey Gordon (Staff)	CRC
John Schneider	DE DNREC
George Onyullo	DOEE
Dinorah Dalmasy	MDE
Bruce Michael	MD DNR
Ben Sears	NYSDEC

Kristen Wolf	PA DEP
Ted Tesler	PA DEP
Dave Montali	WV DEP
Marel King	CBC
Ann Jennings	CBC
Jen Sincock	EPA, R3
Suzanne Trevena	EPA, R3
Chris Day	EPA, R3
Ann Carkhuff	EPA, R3
Bill Angstadt	Angstadt Consulting
Tanya Spano	MWCOG
Jenn Volk	U of Delaware
Sarah Diebel	DOD
Beth McGee	CBF
Norm Goulet	NVRC
Peter Claggett	USGS
Karl Berger	MWCOG
Lindsay Thompson	DMAA