

CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM
WATER QUALITY GOAL IMPLEMENTATION TEAM
September 28, 2015 CONFERENCE CALL
Meeting Minutes

Summary of Action and Decision Items

ACTION: Jurisdictions should provide feedback on the federal milestones process and timeline prior to October 2 (preferred) or October 6 (final). Feedback should be sent to Jim Edward (edward.james@epa.gov) and Greg Allen (allen.greg@epa.gov) and they will distribute it to the proper federal agency contact.

ACTION: To accommodate all nominations received, WQGIT signatory members may resubmit their priority at-large member rankings up until COB Wednesday, September 30. Final announcement of WQGIT at-large members will be distributed via email on Thursday, October 1.

DECISION: The WQGIT approved the inclusion of the three proposed tree canopy land uses in the Beta version of the Phase 6.0 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Model. The approval is contingent upon the following conditions: 1) the relative loading rates be set equal to the relative loading rates of the underlying land use; 2) the partnership understands that the existing BMPs remain unaffected beyond being able to be applied to these new land use categories; and 3) the three tree canopy land uses be reevaluated by the WQGIT prior to the final Phase 6.0 Watershed Model calibration to assess new science on the tree canopy land use loading rates.

DECISION: The WQGIT approved the proposed agriculture land use categories and associated relative loading ratios for the Phase 6.0 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Model.

ACTION: David will distribute the decision rules developed by the Watershed Technical Workgroup that is used to determine how BMPs are distributed across the various land use categories.

DECISION: The WQGIT approved the formation of a Nutrient Management Task Force that will work with the jurisdictions to develop a crosswalk that documents how jurisdictions report acres under nutrient management plans. The crosswalk document will be reviewed by the Agriculture Workgroup and the WQGIT upon completion.

ACTION: WQGIT members may review Dana York's presentation and should contact Dana via email if they have any particular questions related to the BMP Verification Review Panel's feedback and report.

ACTION: Lucinda will send out a request to the WQGIT members to participate on a small group that will work to create an action plan based upon the Phase III WIP Stakeholder Assessment Report.

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

FY16-17 Federal Water Quality Milestones Development – Jim Edward, EPA

Jim walked through the process and [schedule](#) for developing federal water quality milestones and requested jurisdiction feedback on how federal milestones can better support the jurisdictions' milestones.

ACTION: Jurisdictions should provide feedback on the federal milestones process and timeline prior to October 2 (preferred) or October 6 (final). Feedback should be sent to Jim Edward (edward.james@epa.gov) and Greg Allen (allen.greg@epa.gov) and they will distribute it to the proper federal agency contact.

Discussion:

- Scott Phillips (USGS): There are some programmatic milestones we would like to highlight, would those be in the 2-year work plan?
 - Jim Edward (EPA): The management strategy speaks to how 2-year milestones will relate to the 2 year work plan. They should line up pretty closely.
 - Lucinda Power (EPA): We would highlight key milestones that the federal agencies would like to include in the 2-year work plan, but we would provide additional links to the full documentation.
- Phillips: Some of the work on the midpoint assessment, including explaining trends and conducting water quality monitoring, are activities we'd like to reflect in the work plan, but they would also help inform the milestones. Is that an example of something presented in both documents?
 - Power: Yes, it sounds like we would definitely want to capture those items in the work plan, but whether that matches up in the milestones, it depends. But we will make those connections where we can.
- Tanya Spano (MWCOC): If we wanted to get a better idea of who from EPA was working on a particular project and wanted more info, we would check with you, Jim?
 - Edward: Dianne McNally is the EPA Region 3 lead for federal milestones, and is coordinating a lot of this work. We would be able to pass any questions or feedback along once you send it to Greg and I.
- Spano: D.C. has a large number of federal facilities, but will there be a way to discern what is going on in the states with regards to the federal partners from these milestones?
 - Edward: At the end of 2016, we should be able to say what reductions a federal facility has achieved and whether they are on track. We are working on how to share that information.

Election of At-Large Members – James Davis-Martin, Vice-Chair

ACTION: To accommodate all [nominations](#) received, WQGIT signatory members may resubmit their priority at-large member rankings up until COB Wednesday, September 30. Final announcement of WQGIT at-large members will be distributed via email on Thursday, October 1.

Discussion:

- Lee Currey (MDE): Jenn, do you have recommendations, as chair, for what criteria we should consider when selecting our preferred nominees? We looked at creating a balance of advocacy versus science versus finance. Do you have any recommendations on other priorities or principles?
 - Jenn Volk (UD, Chair): I think the priorities you listed are things we discussed in the governance in terms of who we are trying to represent in our at-large membership. I think in some cases it might be difficult, because of varying familiarity with the nominees, so I encourage you all to read the resumes and also to consider who has participated in the WQGIT in the past.
 - James Davis-Martin (VA DEQ, Vice Chair): I would also suggest thinking about sector equity as well.
- Dave Montali (WV DEP): Have all the nominees already agreed to participate if they are selected?
 - Power: Yes, I have asked for folks who have submitted nominations to confirm that the nominee would accept the position, if offered.

Phase 6 Tree Canopy Land Use Categories – Rebecca Hanmer, FWG Chair; and Neely Law, CWP

Neely Law (CWP, Panel Chair) and Rebecca Hanmer (FWG Chair) [reviewed](#) the proposal to include three tree canopy land use classes in the Phase 6 Watershed Model.

Discussion:

- Andy Zemba (PA DEP): There has been concern about how quickly things are moving, not just with this proposal. Once these things are in the Model, they can't be pulled out, right? It's an all or nothing decision, right?
 - Gary Shenk (USGS): We need to make sure everything is set up for the beta version of the Phase 6 Watershed Model (P6 beta) that will be handed over to the partnership on January 1, 2016. As of now, we have all three tree canopy land uses, as proposed, in the P6 beta. 2016 is the year of partnership review, and the WQGIT makes the major decisions on what will be included in the final model, so there is opportunity in 2016 to make changes to the loading rate assumptions and land uses. The modeling team will tell you how long each change will make, and this group will have to prioritize based on how long we have to make those changes, but they are open for discussion in 2016.
- Rebecca Hanmer (FWG Chair): If we take tree canopy land uses out of the calibration at this point, we can't put them back in to test them.
 - Shenk: If we take them out now, which is just saying they are all zero acres, we can put them in for 2016, but they would not be in the P6 beta.
- Davis-Martin: The partnership can spend a year reviewing the P6 beta, but if land uses change, acres change, nutrient management changes, all in 2016, there is no opportunity in the current schedule for the partnership to review the final model. We are reviewing a

model we have accepted is nowhere near the final, and we haven't adjusted the schedule to incorporate a review of the final model. That is a problem.

- Currey: The partnership will be reviewing the P6 beta through next year. There are some things changing, and ideally we want to have the most complete model we can for January, which would give us the most stability. But we need to recognize how much impact tree canopy will really have, more in some areas than others. If we don't include it now, we won't really understand what the total load will likely be, and it will make our discussions of tree canopy's impact in the coming year more difficult. Part of the review process is finding out if the model is simulating what we want it to, and doing it correctly. James' point about the review of the final version and its implications are true, but we anticipate that over 2017 while you are making decisions, the Modeling Workgroup will be running scenarios to help the WQGIT better understand the implications of certain land uses and management decisions.
- Volk: Putting these tree canopy land uses in now allows us to test and get a sense of what this means. Gary said we could take it out, but would need to prioritize the changes that the WQGIT would want to make in 2016. So come 6 months from now when we have a full expert panel report, if the folks with discomfort now still have discomfort, we could take it out?
 - Shenk: Yes.
- Montali: Maybe we could recognize the land use for now, but set it equal to the underlying land use loading rate, let the expert panel finish up their process, and at that point put in alternative loading rates.
- Hanmer: Neely and I have discussed what would happen in terms of completing the UTC report and its review, and a lot of the issues raised are a result of a situation where the information available is less than we wanted. It is unlikely that more studies will be out there by the time the panel completes its work. If we take a chance on using the loading rates as recommended, then that would be probably be a better test of what we know now than if we assume zero and hope we get new information in the next few months.
- Currey: Listening to the last two points, part of it is that we want to simulate the urban landscape as much as possible and tree cover is definitely part of that landscape, so there are great benefits to including it as a land use in the model. We have rushed through this panel, and my concern is we have assumed the nutrient reduction is equivalent to the hydrologic component or the loss of interception. That may be true, but I don't know and I think we have rushed our thinking behind that piece of information. I would think to include it in the modeling system and not give it a reduction benefit right now, only because it gives time for the expert panel to come up with a reasonable reduction. I support tree canopy being a land use, but I question the validity of the 17% reduction. I propose leaving the loading rates equivalent to those of the underlying land uses.
- Volk: Do we have consensus on the tree canopy land uses as proposed by the Forestry Workgroup?
 - Davis Martin: Virginia is not comfortable with approving the Forestry Workgroup (FWG) proposal, as-is. This proposal means we are assuming all trees behave the

same under all storm conditions, which is what the 17% reduction based on intercept is saying. In reality, we can all agree that if you stand under a tree in the light rain, it may intercept 17% but in a heavy rain, you will stand under that tree and still get plenty wet. There is also a difference between conifers and deciduous trees that is not showing up in this proposal either. There are continuing concerns about our ability to accurately hindcast tree canopy conditions throughout all the years of the calibration. Additionally, I don't think it has followed the proper procedures. It has been shared with the Urban Stormwater Workgroup (USWG) but it hasn't been approved by the USWG, so that is a concern as well.

- Volk: With respect to procedure, if a proposal isn't approved by consensus by a workgroup below us, it does get elevated to us to resolve the issue.
- Norm Goulet (NVRC, USWG Chair): There definitely was not consensus at the meeting. There were enough questions asked that I requested signatories to submit questions, comments and concerns via email following the meeting. The FWG [responded](#) to those comments, which were posted. There was definitely no consensus. The workgroup hasn't had a chance to do follow-up based on responses from the FWG, but as far as we're concerned it is a WQGIT issue at this point.
- Zemba: So, sending this proposal back to the USWG will not help us?
 - Goulet: From the USWG perspective, it is coming down to an issue of time. We were told this proposal needed to be decided upon at this meeting in order for it to be included in the P6 beta.
- Zemba: If there was enough time, do you think there could have been consensus?
 - Goulet: I think eventually yes, but certainly not in one meeting. The questions raised were along the lines of the ones raised in the presentation today, and it would have taken some time to work through those.
 - Hanmer: I think had we had time to go back to the USWG, we would have had further discussion on Olivia Devereux's [proposed method](#) for addressing the double counting concern, and EPA's offer of assistance to do the tree canopy mapping in Virginia would significantly address the mapping issues in Virginia's detailed comments, which we read very carefully. As I understand it, based on the Land Use Workgroup [memo](#), tree canopy is no more difficult to hindcast than any of the other land uses. I think it comes back to the discomfort about the expert panel's recommendations on loadings. It may not be possible in the next 6 months to do new studies. I don't know if there is a way in the Bay Program to look at this issue and make a management adjustment. There is maybe a distinction between applying the recommended loading rates to the pervious cover, and looking at the information we have, only 11% is over impervious. If the big issue is the rate of tree canopy over impervious, do you need to throw out the whole set of recommendations, or can we make an adjustment for the purpose of testing?
- Davis-Martin: Some numbers don't make sense to me in terms of which percentages of tree canopy acreages are over each underlying land use. It is 51% tree canopy over turf

grass, 37% tree canopy over open space, and 11% over pervious. And of the 11% over impervious, 90% are over roads?

- Hanmer: Based on what we have today, those are the percentages.
 - Davis-Martin: Yes, based on 30m pixel size in the NLCD that we use in Phase 5.3.2. I ask everyone to look at those numbers and ask if that passes the sniff test when you think about what you see as you drive around your state.
- Mary Searing (DOEE): I agree with Lee Currey's proposal of adding in the three tree canopy land uses but applying the loading rates of the underlying land uses.
- Ben Sears (NYSDEC): New York does not have a strong opinion on the issue.
- Currey: I am mentioning my proposal to separate out the issues. We need to at least map it first. My thinking is if we can map it and get it into the modeling system, we capture a key feature, and we can then begin to spend more efforts on understanding the difference in loading rates and whether that difference exists.
- Suzanne Trevena (EPA, R3): I am not objecting, but I would suggest a provisional approval. There are a lot of lingering questions. I am willing to move forward, but we have a few areas of concerns. I can follow up later, but I'd like explanations of how we are dealing with double counting and how we will credit this on an annual basis, but I think that will be addressed by the expert panel at another time.
- Davis-Martin: As the sole dissenter, it is incumbent upon me to offer an alternative proposal. I would offer, as an alternative, that for the October calibration, we do not include tree canopy as a land use. We zero those acres out and simulate urban land classes that we had finalized back in October, 2014. I don't want to give the impression that Virginia is not in favor of tree canopy or expanding tree canopy, we absolutely are, we support the Watershed Agreement Outcome in that regard. I want to encourage the panel to continue its work and to come forward when they have a reasonable, well thought out proposal that we can consider for inclusion in the final calibration. And if nothing better materializes, it is okay if we don't have tree canopy as a land use category, because that doesn't preclude us from having it as a BMP. There are lots of times we have had a BMP, and when the model is calibrated, all BMPs on the ground at the time of calibration are accounted for and baked into the model and we would then just have to focus on reporting expansion of canopy in the future. I think there are other workarounds here and I don't see the value in adopting it at this point. I think it will add confusion in terms of the model review.
- Currey: If we include it as a land use based on our current information but kept the loading rates the same as the underlying land uses, it would provide information moving forward on where we have more acres of tree canopy. If we include it at the same loading rates, the review process would provide information that be helpful to us and could potentially inform the expert panel as well.
 - Ted Tesler (PA DEP): We already have it as a layer. We have doubts we'd be able to develop new science between now and when we'd have to make a final decision. We share James' concern about the amount of time to do this for this calibration. Especially because once we do it, we will be committed to it, no one

is going to go through this effort and not expect it to happen. We have reservations about what we are planning to do here.

- Currey: I don't see the argument.
- Davis-Martin: We have already reported our historical BMPs, or are about to. Those are based on the land use classes we agreed to in October 2014. I understand there are procedures by which we can redistribute BMPs across all of the urban classes. I understand we can make assumptions and adjust based on that, but should we? Do the BMPs have the same effects on urban lands with tree canopy as opposed to urban lands without? I don't know. Do all BMPs available for non-tree canopied urban lands eligible for tree canopy lands as well? For example, pervious pavers, if there is tree canopy over a pervious paver, how do we handle that in the model?
- Volk: James, you oppose the alternative as well and would rather we zero out the acres and allow the expert panel to keep working?
 - Davis-Martin: Yes, that is correct.
- Volk: Could all parties live with the proposal that for the Phase 6 Beta, all three tree canopy land uses be included and the loading rates set equal to the loading rates of the underlying land use?
 - Davis-Martin: I don't know. Because of questions like the ones I just posed. I don't know how it all fits together with existing BMPs. There are just too many questions about how we overlay our BMPs on this land use class that haven't been thought through yet.
 - Volk: I am going to clarify and say that Virginia can't live with Lee's proposal.
- Shenk: James, when you said that we should move forward with the land use classes that were approved in October 2014, that included one tree canopy land use over pervious.
 - Davis-Martin: I didn't intend that. We had it on the list but because it required further clarification, I didn't consider that one as final. I didn't mean to include a single tree canopy class.
- Montali: If this decision gets moved to the Management Board, we will have a vote on both the inclusion of the land uses and the loading rates together. I think this is a good compromise, and I think we can agree it is a good thing to map tree canopy over time. We can let the panel keep working, and maybe put the pressure on them to better define the actual pathways that are occurring. But if we get this situation where Virginia is the only one adamant about disapproving, that has a stronger chance of getting overruled at the Management Board, which would push past some of my concerns about the 17% number needing to be fully vetted.
 - Davis-Martin: I think you make a strong point, and I recognize that it is our process where the Management Board can use super majority vote. If given no other choice, can someone at the Bay Program give me assurance that for the P6 beta, we will treat all BMPs exactly the same regardless of whether they are applied to tree canopy subclasses or the underlying land use class?
 - Shenk: Yes, if the underlying land use classes are the same, and the percentages are the same, they would have the same treatment. That is true.

- Davis-Martin: But do you agree that there are lots of interactions that may need to be considered?
 - Shenk: I think you are right, but we can only investigate those things if we have the land use in there.
- Matt Johnston (UMD, WTWG Coordinator): For the WTWG, this is a separate issue. The WTWG has already reviewed and approved the land use groups for our BMPs on a default basis, but those are open for review next year just like everything else. If during your review you want to suggest different land use groups to apply BMPs to, that is entirely fine.
 - Tesler: But we have to set priorities and I don't see this rising to the level of having enough information to answer these questions in time. I don't see it being different enough to justify making things significantly more complicated without a significant benefit. I have to question why we are doing this for such a modest benefit. I am not sure we have the information on the extent of the impact that this will have. I recognize that we can maybe look at this in the P6 beta, and maybe that will be helpful but I don't think the information we have is sufficient.
- Volk: Where do Pennsylvania and West Virginia stand on the proposal of including the land use categories but setting the loading rates equal to the loading rates of the underlying land uses?
 - Kristen Wolf (PA DEP): I think what Ted is saying about prioritization is this is happening across multiple workgroups. We need to be realistic about what we can prioritize and not prioritize. If we had the time we absolutely support this, but with time restrictions I don't know if we can do everything being put forward today on this.
 - Davis-Martin: In the interest of trying to reach consensus, and to move this thing along, I will say that with understanding that the BMPs will stay just like they are except that you can apply them now to a few more urban classes, and that all we are going to do is test our ability to map these land use classes and hindcast for the beta calibration, but with exact same loading rates as the underlying land uses, I will say I can live with it. But as Pennsylvania was saying, I have concerns that by doing this, next year when we reconsider this with the same amount of information, that others will say that we never should have approved it if we didn't intend to make the change. The reason I am saying I can live with it is to give the time to find the supporting science. Studies in California or Australia aren't representative of the climatic regime in the Mid-Atlantic, and the two Mid-Atlantic studies were modeling studies, and as we saw with Nutrient Management, partners are concerned about using modeling studies as the basis for making loading rate decisions. Unless there is better info or new science, I can't see it moving forward next year.
- Volk: I share Virginia and Pennsylvania's concern that if the ultimate decision in 6 months is that we can't live with it, I am concerned that we will hear from the land use and modeling folks that it will be too hard and too late. If they commit to it being possible to review this decision in 2016, I will be more comfortable.

- Shenk: I think it will be highly likely that it will be worth the time. It will not be a major effort, it will be a few days' work of a few people.
- Volk: To clarify, we all have consensus? We can live with the proposal to move forward with these land uses for the Phase 6 beta version of the Watershed Model and with the setting the loading rates equal to the loading rates of the underlying land uses? If not, please speak up now.
 - No objections were raised.

DECISION: The WQGIT approved the inclusion of the three proposed tree canopy land uses in the Beta version of the Phase 6.0 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Model. The approval is contingent upon the following conditions: 1) the relative loading rates be set equal to the relative loading rates of the underlying land use; 2) the partnership understands that the existing BMPs remain unaffected beyond being able to be applied to these new land use categories; and 3) the three tree canopy land uses be reevaluated by the WQGIT prior to the final Phase 6.0 Watershed Model calibration to assess new science on the tree canopy land use loading rates.

Agriculture Land Use Loading Rates – Tom Jordan, SI; Gene Yagow, VT; and Jack Meisinger, USDA ARS

Tom Jordan [reviewed](#) the Agriculture Loading Rate Committee's recommended relative loading rates and the WQGIT members were asked to make the final determination on the [agriculture land uses](#).

Discussion:

- Kristen Saacke Blunk (Headwaters LLC, AgWG Co-Chair): The agenda states that the Agriculture Workgroup (AgWG) approved these loading rates during their quarterly meeting. I would clarify and say that the AgWG's action was we had consensus in affirming these recommendations. They affirmed to move forward with these loading ratios in the P6 beta testing phase. My concern is that soy bean is depicted as non-manured, and there is some question about whether that is an accurate place to start. I am getting conflicting feedback on the acres eligible for manure. What are the ad-hoc team's thoughts?
- Rachel Rhodes (MDA): In the Annual Implementation Reports (AIR) it is a very, very small percentage of soy bean crops that receive manure.
 - Davis-Martin: Does that include biosolids application?
 - Rhodes: No.
 - Davis-Martin: How much received biosolids?
 - Rhodes: I don't know that information.
 - Jack Meisinger (USDA ARS): We don't have a lot of data, and Maryland is the only state that has that information, which is what we used. We just don't have any other information from any other states or any information for biosolids. There are some categories here that I personally would like to have more observations for, but my understanding is that we can continue to fill in the lesser

known areas over the next month or two such as corn silage. It can get a fairly heavy load but we would like to build that up a little.

- Davis-Martin: First, for the phosphorus and sediment loading ratios, using RUSLE and APLE as the basis for those values, my concern stems from the scale of our model. Even at the finest scale of the Watershed Model, there can be many soil series within the land river segment. Would we use some average or the predominant soil for the RUSLE calculation?
 - Shenk: Peter Claggett (USGS) and a graduate student are looking at a method where they are doing this on a 30m raster, and aggregating to a land river segment. It will be aggregated but takes into account a fine scale.
 - Davis-Martin: That is an improvement from how we do it now, correct?
 - Shenk: Yes, we are fortunate to have this come in.
 - Mark Dubin (UMD, AgWG Coordinator): I would also add that the committee looked at the RUSLE2 version, they are using the most current version, which is a huge step forward from what has been used in the past. By and large I think the committee felt very comfortable with the values they are seeing.
- Davis-Martin: In terms of distinguishing between multiple land use classes, the vast majority of these currently fall into cropland?
 - Dubin: Yes, the original land use recommendations basically had these specific land uses, and they can be rolled up to broader land use classes. It was a tiered system that was developed.
- Davis-Martin: So all of these subclasses are enumerated and counted in the Ag census. Has anyone taken a look at the Ag census data in terms of how much variability there is at these more detailed classifications?
 - Dubin: Moving forward, we will be making use of annual survey data and 5 year data where needed. Many of these are reported annually by USDA NASS.
 - Davis-Martin: It is likely to be highly variable through time, and I think trying to discern a trend will be a lot harder.
 - Meisinger: I think that is a great question and is a task that could be done. A lot of these land uses go with the livestock systems, which don't change quickly. Some pieces will be stable, others will fluctuate. Knowing which are more stable versus more variable would be good information.
 - Jordan: For some of these, especially nitrogen, there is a big lag time, so some year by year fluctuations will be damped out.
- Dubin: The underlying premise of this is that these are elements of a crop rotation system. As Jack mentioned, there will be differences between rotations, and the different systems will have different impacts on loading over time.
- Davis-Martin: If you have to apply BMPs to each of these land use classes, I assume the nutrient management plan, for instance, would be distributed proportionally across each of these crop acres.
 - Johnston: Yes.
 - Davis-Martin: Even though in each year they might be treating a different crop type?

- Johnston: Just like in Phase 5.3.2, states are able to report the specific crop type if they want to, but they can also report a larger, more general classification.
 - Dubin: That's correct, it was designed that way.
- Davis-Martin: So going back and relooking at BMPs and how they are distributed is still fair game?
 - Johnston: Yes, there are decision rules that you all can make.
- Volk: Are you comfortable with being able to establish decision rules for how the BMPs are distributed across these more detailed classes?
 - Davis-Martin: Yes, I think so.
 - Trevena: Our suggestion is that we understand this is approved for Phase 6, but that we have these decision rules agreed upon prior to reporting for Phase 6. Understanding not every state can report to this level of detail.
- Davis-Martin: The deadline would be the final calibration right?
 - Johnston: Yes.
- Volk: Do we have consensus of these loading rates and land use groups?
 - No objections were raised

DECISION: The WQGIT approved the proposed agriculture land use categories and associated relative loading ratios for the Phase 6.0 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Model.

ACTION: David will distribute the decision rules developed by the Watershed Technical Workgroup that is used to determine how BMPs are distributed across the various land use categories.

Nutrient Management Task Force – Kristen Saacke Blunk, AgWG Co-Chair

In response to a WQGIT request during the September 14 conference call, the AgWG presented the formal [charge and membership](#) for the proposed Nutrient Management Task Force. The WQGIT was asked to approve the charge and membership.

Discussion:

- Volk: Reminder that this concept came from a letter from a group of stakeholders about concerns with the Phase 5.3.2 Nutrient Management panel recommendations and asked for gaining a better understanding of what states are going to be reporting.
- Davis-Martin: Question about the second bullet where it says the task force would, “identify for the Ag Workgroup any concerns about inconsistencies within/between the states’ crosswalks and planned methodologies for reporting acres of nutrient management implementation by tier.”
 - Saacke Blunk: This was in response to what we heard from the WQGIT on September 14 regarding revised language about looking for compliance rates. We heard that compliance is not what we are trying to get at, but rather whether there are gray areas about how the tiers being reported meet the definitions outlined by the expert panel. It would be nice to know that a tier II credit reported by one state

has about the same value as a tier II credit reported by another. I think it is a place-saver. There may be questions we may not know to ask at this point because it is a bit of a fact finding mission.

- Davis-Martin: I don't want this crosswalk to turn into another group weighing in on our verification protocols as they exist today or plan to exist when fully implemented. It feels like this bullet is walking that thin line and I ask that you stay on the right side of it.
 - Saacke Blunk: We know you have the ultimate responsibility for the verification program plans.
- Tesler: Would we be able to report the tiered nutrient management for this year's progress?
 - Volk: Yes, the goal is to report this year. This would lay out what you plan to be submitting.
- Davis-Martin: Is the envisioned crosswalk table set up to recognize that there may be changes through time as we move towards 2017?
 - Saacke Blunk: That is a good point. Maybe that is exactly what we need to be looking at. Build the crosswalk table on current information, but recognize that it will be evolving. I think that is important.
- Volk: Are there any objections or concerns you would like to raise now?
 - Davis-Martin: I think you discussed the potential for adding additional members or getting information from people who are not listed as part of the proposed membership, correct?
 - Saacke Blunk: Yes, we would send the table back to each state and make sure they agree that we are asking for the right things. These were volunteers proposed, and we will make sure the states are advising us on this effort. The information is in the states' hands. We will try to develop the crosswalk template, but it needs to fit the way you'll be getting data in one or two years.
 - Davis-Martin: So you will design the template, send it to state experts who fill it in, and then send it back to the membership?
 - Saacke Blunk: Yes. We will start with some of the information provided by the nutrient management panel, and we will go from there.
- Davis-Martin: Please incorporate a way for all jurisdictions to have their stamp of approval, in order to ensure the crosswalk is representative of what they are actually reporting.
 - Dubin: This will be coming to the AgWG, where all jurisdictions are represented as well.
- Volk: I received an email from Ben Sears (NYSDEC) that he had concerns with this issue because he was concerned it would take focus from the verification effort. I would respond by saying my hope is this doesn't divert focus, but rather add focus.
- Wolf: I would ask whether we feel comfortable with this timeline. I know time is short, but is this manageable?
 - Volk: It is aggressive, but in order to have the crosswalk by November 9, this is what we need to do.

- Volk: Do we have consensus to approve the formation of the proposed nutrient management task force?
 - No objections were raised.

DECISION: The WQGIT approved the formation of a Nutrient Management Task Force that will work with the jurisdictions to develop a crosswalk that documents how jurisdictions report acres under nutrient management plans. The crosswalk document will be reviewed by the Agriculture Workgroup and the WQGIT upon completion.

Agriculture Modeling Subcommittee Methodology – Curt Dell, AMS Chair

- Due to time constraints, this presentation was postponed to a later WQGIT conference call.

Phase III WIP stakeholder assessment – Frank Dukes, IEN

Frank [presented](#) the draft Phase III WIP [stakeholder assessment](#) to the WQGIT, officially kicking off the 45-day review and comment period of the draft report.

Discussion:

- Power: Are there any volunteers to participate in the small group to help put together an action plan based upon this draft report?
 - Dianne McNally, Suzanne Trevena, Kristen Wolf, and Mary Gattis (LGAC) volunteered. James Davis-Martin offered to suggest a participant by the end of the week.

ACTION: Lucinda will send out a request to the WQGIT members to participate on a small group that will work to create an action plan based upon the Phase III WIP Stakeholder Assessment Report.

- Davis-Martin: We may need some local government participants on that small group.
- Spano: MWCOC will be reviewing and commenting on the draft Stakeholder Assessment. I mirror James' comment. Will the action plan come back to WQGIT before going to the Management Board?
- Volk: Yes, I wanted to ask about that because the Management Board agenda calls for a decision.
 - Power: Yes, we noted to the Management Board that decisional language on the action plan is premature at this point. We will not be asking for approval or decision of this action plan until the January timeframe.

BMP Verification Review Panel Initial Evaluation Findings – Dana York, Panel Chair

- Due to time constraints, this presentation was cancelled.
- York: The [Powerpoint](#) for the WQGIT was a little more detailed than what will be presented at the Management Board, so please take a look, but we would welcome your

participation during the Management Board meeting. That presentation is scheduled for 11:35am on Wednesday, September 30.

ACTION: WQGIT members may review Dana York's presentation and should contact Dana via email if they have any particular questions related to the BMP Verification Review Panel's feedback and report.

Adjourn

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
Lindsey Gordon (Staff)	CRC
Kristen Saacke Blunk	AgWG Co-Chair
Chris Pomeroy	Alterra Trading
Jessica Blackburn	CAC
Marel King	CBC
Ann Jennings	CBC
Jill Witkowski-Heaps	CCW
Neely Law	CWP
John Schneider	DE DNREC
Ann Baldwin	DE NRCS
Olivia Devereux	Devereux Environmental Consulting
Bill Angstadt	DMAA
George Onyullo	DOEE
Mary Searing	DOEE
Jim Edward	EPA, CBPO
Greg Allen	EPA, CBPO
Jeff Sweeney	EPA, CBPO
Jen Sincock	EPA, R3
Chris Day	EPA, R3
Suzanne Trevena	EPA, R3
Ann Carkhuff	EPA, R3
Rebecca Hanmer	FWG Chair
Jenny Tribo	HRPDC
Jamie Mitchell	HRSD
Mary Gattis	LGAC
Bruce Michael	MD DNR
Jason Keppler	MDA
Dinorah Dalmasy	MDE
Lee Currey	MDE

Karl Berger	MWCOG
Tanya Spano	MWCOG
Norm Goulet	NVRC
Ben Sears	NY DEC
Andy Zemba	PA DEP
Kristen Wolf	PA DEP
Ted Tesler	PA DEP
Tom Jordan	Smithsonian
Kevin McGonigal	SRBC
Mark Dubin	UMD, CBPO
Matt Johnston	UMD, CBPO
Sally Claggett	USFS
Scott Phillips	USGS
Gary Shenk	USGS
Peter Claggett	USGS
Joel Blomquist	USGS
Angela Redwine	VDH
Dana York	Verification Review Panel Chair
Jeremy Hanson	VT, CBPO
Dave Montali	WV DEP