

CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM
WATER QUALITY GOAL IMPLEMENTATION TEAM
December 8, 2014 CONFERENCE CALL

SUMMARY OF ACTION AND DECISION ITEMS:

Decision: The WQGIT approved the stakeholder assessment proposal. Please note that Katherine Antos will provide regular progress updates to the WQGIT and that there will be continued opportunities to provide feedback throughout the process.

Action: Please contact Katherine Antos (Antos.Katherine@epa.gov) with comments or feedback on the stakeholder assessment proposal by December 31, 2014.

Action: Red flag issues or major concerns on the draft Water Quality Management Strategy should be sent to Lucinda Power (Power.Lucinda@epa.gov) by COB Thursday, December 11.

Action: Matt Johnston will add two questions to the Historic Data Cleanup FAQ document to address federal spreadsheets and the question of land use changes and their impact on historic data collection.

Action: The WQGIT will discuss different options for including improved data in the next milestones period during upcoming conference calls.

Action: Send any questions or feedback on the historic data cleanup process to Matt (mjohnston@chesapeakebay.net), Jeff (jsweeney@chesapeakebay.net), or Katherine (Antos.Katherine@epa.gov).

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 met on 11/20 to discuss the LUWG responsibilities for the 2017 Mid-Point Assessment and the methods for developing the Phase 6 land use data set.
- The next meeting will be scheduled for late January 2015.

Agriculture Workgroup

- The Agriculture Workgroup help a joint meeting with the Watershed Technical Workgroup and WQGIT to review the Nutrient Management expert panel report. A revised report is expected for another round of review in the late December timeframe.
- The Agriculture Workgroup meets on December 11th to discuss Delaware's crop residue transect survey and recommendations for the Phase 6.0 expert panel process.

Urban Stormwater Workgroup

- The Urban Stormwater Workgroup has a conference call scheduled for December 16th, where they will be discussing updating MS4 overlays in Phase 6 of the Watershed Model, and land use loading rate targets.

Forestry Workgroup

- FWG members and interested stakeholders met on December 3rd for a face-to-face meeting devoted to the Urban Tree Canopy management strategy. Participants discussed current efforts, gaps, actions, and tracking options.
- FWG members and interested stakeholders met on December 4th for a face-to-face meeting devoted to the Riparian Forest Buffer management strategy. Participants discussed barriers and strategic actions to address barriers.

Toxics Workgroup

- There are two toxic contaminants outcomes (1) Research and (2) Policy and Prevention. The TCW has established a subgroup for each outcome.
- The Full TCWG kick off meeting was held on 11-5-14, the Policy and Prevention subgroup meeting was on 11-18-14.
- The research subgroup is devising a framework to identify and prioritize knowledge gaps related to occurrence, concentrations, sources and effects of contaminants. An RFP has been released for a project that will identify which BMPs provide multiple benefits for reducing nutrients, sediment and toxic contaminants.
- The Policy and Prevention subgroup is assessing a source sector approach to addressing PCBs in the final management strategy. Jurisdictions have been asked to submit information regarding PCB source sectors from existing PCB TMDLs and other program activities in their jurisdiction.
- Tom Fikslin of the Delaware River Basin Commission will be joining two upcoming meetings to present on PCB reductions in the Delaware River Basin.
- Next meetings: Full TCWG face to face meeting will be held on 12-10-14, the Policy and Prevention subgroup conference call will be on 12-18-14, Full WG face to face meeting on 1-8-15.

Watershed Technical Workgroup

- The Watershed Technical Workgroup held a conference call on 12/4 to discuss historic data cleanup. They also heard a presentation comparing the NRCS cost-shared BMP implementation levels to historically reported CBP BMP implementation levels.
- WTWG approved the Shoreline Management expert panel report.
- The next WTWG meeting is scheduled for January 8th.

Trading and Offsets Workgroup

- The Trading and Offsets Workgroup met on 11/19 to discuss tracking and accounting for new nutrient and sediment loads.
- The next TOWG meeting is scheduled for December 17th.

Wastewater Treatment Workgroup

- The Wastewater Treatment Workgroup met on 12/2 to discuss EPA's programmatic milestones evaluations for the wastewater sector.
- The WWTWG determined a path forward to further evaluate and address two proprietary BMP proposals.

- The WWTWG is working with the states to collect biosolids and spray irrigation data.
- The next WWTWG meeting is scheduled for January 6th.

Stakeholder Assessment – Katherine Antos, EPA

- Katherine provided an overview of the stakeholder assessment that will be conducted to gather lessons learned from the Phase I and II WIPs in order to inform expectations for Phase III WIPs.
 - For more information please see the [proposal document](#).
- Katherine Antos (EPA): I want to highlight a few points about this stakeholder assessment:
 - We want to hear from a wide range of partners, but the Phase III WIPs are not going to be everything to everyone. I don't want to set false expectations.
 - The feedback will be confidential unless otherwise requested.
 - These will be one-on-one phone conversations between the contractor and the stakeholder rather than conversations with focus groups or public meetings.
 - This project is rooted in the Midpoint Assessment guiding principles, which means that we want to be facilitating implementation, improving decision support, addressing emerging issues, and providing adaptive management.
 - This project is set to be completed by December 2015. Interviews will be complete by June 2015 with a draft report and presentation to the WQGIT in September 2015.

Discussion:

- Jenn Volk (Chair, U of Delaware): When will the one-on-one phone conversations with stakeholders begin?
 - Antos: The work plan should be finalized by January 2015 so that the conversations can begin in February.
- Lee Currey (MDE): Will the WQGIT have a chance to see the list of questions being asked in these conversations before they begin?
 - Antos: This will not be a set survey or questionnaire, it will be a series of open ended discussions. I have outlined what the general topics will be, and if the WQGIT has feedback now on additional topics that should be covered, please contact me soon. The contractor may be able to present to the WQGIT around February 2015 with more details about the work plan.
- Dave Montali (WV DEP): I would suspect that in the year of the Phase 6 Watershed Model evaluation, beginning in 2016, the partners will ask at what scale the Watershed Model would be appropriate for setting local area targets.
 - Antos: That is one reason why EPA will not develop Phase III WIP expectations until 2016-17. I hope this assessment can help us understand the best format to provide the targets, and if the Watershed Model doesn't address that issue, we can figure out what format we can use to better communicate with our local partners. Please suggest any specific language that would better help communicate that concern.
- Dianne McNally (EPA): The plan is to have the stakeholder assessment report to the WQGIT in December 2015 for a 45 day review and comment period. What kind of review do you envision the WQGIT providing to this process?
 - Antos: The WQGIT can comment on whether or not they understand the summary findings and if those findings provide all the information the stakeholders need. The WQGIT will see a summary of what we heard back from stakeholders prior to the open

comment period and the stakeholders interviewed will have the opportunity to make sure their feedback was captured properly. However, if they didn't catch something at that point, the 45 day comment period would be a chance to catch those issues.

- Norm Goulet (NVRC): I would suggest the assessment target local elected officials, but not through LGAC, which is not truly representative. I also suggest the assessment target local staff. Phase III is where the rubber meets the road, and having a set of thought processes from the local level is important.
 - Antos: Please provide feedback as to who those officials and staff should be so we can provide the best names to the contractor.
- Volk: Will you be sharing a complete list of who was interviewed?
 - Antos: We will be discussing that. There may be a list of the participants and their organizations that wouldn't be attributed directly to the comments, but that has yet to be decided.
- Antos: Are there more suggestions for topics that should be discussed in the one-on-one conversations?
 - James Davis-Martin (Vice-Chair, VA DEQ): It is important to frame the discussion so that respondents understand the full accountability framework as they develop their Phase III WIPs.
- Antos: Hearing no other feedback on topics, are there suggestions for particular stakeholders that should be included in this assessment. We will be able to hold about 75 conversations.
- Davis-Martin: I suggest more consideration be given to the concept of one-on-one phone calls. While we may lose some anonymity, local stakeholder advisory groups may be an easier way to collect input from a broad group of stakeholders. For Virginia, I would suggest the Chesapeake Bay Stakeholder Advisory group that the Secretary of Natural Resources has established.
 - Antos: I will mention that. However, EPA's Conflict Prevention and Resolution Center advised against doing these types of meetings because of confidentiality, high travel costs, and the difficulty of getting stakeholders together. Another option to consider is that if the facilitator can't attend an assessment meeting, the partnership could pass along their concerns since they are aware of the topics being discussed.
- Goulet: The Northern Virginia Regional Commission also has a stakeholder workgroup. It would not be difficult to set up a conference call between that group and the contractor. They won't care about confidentiality.
- Currey: Katherine, I will get you in touch with the Hughes Center, because we do a very similar process with them annually. Their information may be valuable feedback for you.
- Lucinda Power (Coordinator, EPA): Is there a specific deadline for comments or suggestions?
 - Antos: The end of December. There will also be an opportunity to submit additional feedback when we present the final work plan in February 2015.
- Volk: Anyone opposed to moving forward with the stakeholder assessment proposal?
 - Davis-Martin: I ask for the opportunity to weigh in again as this proposal moves forward.
 - Antos: Absolutely.
- Volk: Not hearing any objections, and knowing there will be more opportunities to provide feedback, the WQGIT approves the assessment proposal.

Decision: The WQGIT approved the stakeholder assessment proposal. Please note that Katherine Antos will provide regular progress updates to the WQGIT and that there will be continued opportunities to provide feedback throughout the process.

Action: Please contact Katherine Antos (Antos.Katherine@epa.gov) with comments or feedback on the stakeholder assessment proposal by December 31, 2014.

Management Strategy for Water Quality Outcomes – Lucinda Power, EPA

- Lucinda reviewed the preliminary draft of the Management Strategy for the 2017, 2025, and WQ standards attainment and monitoring outcomes under the 2014 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement.
 - For more information, please see the [draft document](#).

Discussion:

- Davis-Martin: This is definitely a good start, and I will send Lucinda some comments off-line. The biennial workplan section may be a little light.
- Volk: I also had some minor suggestions for how to emphasize a few points. I will send those to Lucinda off-line. If anyone has any major concerns, send those by COB Thursday, December 11 so they can be incorporated by Monday, December 15.
- Volk: Are there any concerns with having this draft document serve as an early management strategy proposal?
 - No concerns were raised.

Action: Red flag issues or major concerns on the draft Water Quality Management Strategy should be sent to Lucinda Power (Power.Lucinda@epa.gov) by COB Thursday, December 11.

Management Strategy Update – Sally Claggett, USFS

- Sally Claggett (USFS) provided an update on the Urban Tree Canopy management strategy:
 - A summit was held on October 14-15 as a kickoff meeting. There were 80 participants.
 - We were able to get a first crack at barriers and actions.
 - There is a report that will be released from the summit, which will be available on the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay's [website](#).
 - Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay is assisting with writing the management strategy.
 - A draft will be available on December 15th.
 - For more information, please see the FWG's [calendar page](#).
- Claggett: Updates on Riparian Forest Buffer management strategy:
 - A lot of focus has been on fixing the conservation reserve enhancement program (CREP) that is already in place.
 - A summit was held on June 19th to kick-off the state task force process.
 - Draft reports from each task force were submitted in early November and outlined important necessary actions.
 - The Forestry Workgroup (FWG) has looked at the task force reports and is ranking and prioritizing the necessary actions.
 - For more info on the progress see the FWG [calendar page](#).

Discussion:

- Davis-Martin: What is the plan for getting these drafts circulated? Who will be reviewing them?

- Volk: For December 15th, it will be coordinators and staffers within the Bay Program only. After that time, there will be other mechanisms to circulate them more broadly. The Management Board will review them in mid-January to identify large-scale issues. It will not be for approval at that point.
- Davis-Martin: Does Lucinda have everything she needs for the review?
 - Power: I don't have the drafts yet but I will know more on December 15th.

Management Strategy Update – Greg Allen, EPA

- Greg Allen (EPA) provided an update on the Toxic Contaminants Workgroup (TCWG) and their Management Strategy draft.
 - The TCWG kickoff meeting was held on November 5.
 - The workgroup was divided into two subgroups, one to address each of the management strategy outcomes: Research, and Policy and Prevention.
 - Research Outcome: We decided to start with the ten contaminant groups discussed in the December 2012 toxic contaminants report. We will work to review our current research and prioritize those groups. Additionally, the RFP is out for a recipient to look across the literature and see what we know at this point about different BMPs abilities to reduce toxic contaminants in addition to nutrients and sediments.
 - Policy and Prevention Outcome: We are planning to develop a common set of source sector descriptors for PCBs by looking at the TMDLs already in place for PCBs and how they are currently being defined. Once we have the source sector descriptors, we will look at what the TMDLs say about necessary management actions. We have not decided on whether we can talk about reducing other toxics in this management strategy, but we are definitely beginning with PCBs.
 - December 15th is far from pencils down for us. It is just a chance to outline what I've just discussed in a little more detail. I can provide these updates to the WQGIT periodically as we move forward.

Discussion:

- Beth McGee (CBF): When looking at PCBs, will the TCWG look at what is being done outside of the Chesapeake Bay Watershed?
 - Allen: Yes, Tom Fixlin from the Delaware estuary is on our agenda for the next two meetings.
- Davis-Martin: Will the initial focus of the research outcome be developing the research you need for other contaminants?
 - Allen: Yes, we need to develop it so that when we are ready to move beyond PCBs, we know what the next priorities are. There is a need for these two outcomes to be working together.
- Davis-Martin: Because these two outcomes are so interrelated, do you see them as being two separate management strategies, or only one?
 - Allen: They have always been discussed as one management strategy with two separate outcomes. We will point out how the two outcomes are intended to work together.

Milestones updates – Jeff Sweeney, EPA

- Jeff provided an overview of the impacts that the new land use data will have on milestones and progress.
 - For more information, please see the [summary document](#).

Discussion:

- Davis-Martin: The load changes being represented are changes as a result of a new crop acres, rather than a model simulation change? The rest of the modeling system is constant, all that has changed is the acres of each crop type?
 - Sweeney: Correct.
- Jason Keppler (MDA): Is this a national trend in corn and soybean prices?
 - Sweeney: Yes.
- Currey: It is very instructive to look at the same scenario with both the old and new data. We want to include the best information as possible, and we have made the decision to do that as soon as possible. But by doing so, it has made it impossible to compare year to year. I would like to put it back on the table to think about how we put new information into these tools. Right now, it is very difficult to compare whether your loads are going up or down. I want us to consider making changes prior to the two year milestone period, and locking them down for those two years.
- Davis-Martin: We need to look at the context of what we face going from Phase 5.3.2 of the Watershed Model to Phase 6. It will be similar in that there will be large swings in the loads.
- Marel King (CBC): With BMP implementation, the loads should be reduced significantly. This emphasizes the need for enhanced verification.
- Volk: If folks have other questions or concerns, they can reach out to Jeff directly. We will need to keep the discussion of when to incorporate new data on the agenda over the next few months.
- Antos: Since we are in the process of doing the 2014 progress run, we need to consider it as something for the next milestone period.
- Currey: We already voted on the 2014/15 milestone period, but I would like to start the conversation now so that we can possibly make a change for the next milestone period.

Action: The WQGIT will discuss different options for including improved data in the next milestones period during upcoming conference calls.

Historic Data Cleanup – Matt Johnston, UMD

- Matt discussed expectations and next steps for the historic data cleanup effort.
 - For more information, please see the [summary document](#).

Discussion:

- Davis-Martin: I thought the WQGIT decided at the [October face-to-face](#) that we should focus historic data cleanup efforts on 2000 to the present and that we only go back further if possible. Are you asking for a change to that decision?
 - Matt Johnston (UMD): No, that is definitely still the approach. Questions 3 and 4 in the FAQ section of the summary document address that concern.
- Montali: Is it reasonable for states to fall back on the data that is already in the Phase 5.3.2 Watershed Model if we don't have better data?

- Johnston: That is addressed in Question 6 of the FAQ's. The data is Scenario Builder-ready, not NEIEN-ready. It can be done, but it will take a good deal of effort by the states to convert it to the proper format.
 - Sweeney: Just submit the best you can. At the end of the process, please look over the data and make sure the implementation level makes sense. Make sure, for instance, that cumulative BMP data doesn't go up and down.
- Joel Blomquist (USGS): I like the way this discussion is going. Zeroing out a database and interpolating and would render the results of our analysis useless. Whatever we can do to document our relative certainty around our estimates would be a tremendous help for those trying to interpret the effects of implementation. A confidence estimate is very helpful.
- Davis-Martin: Matt, is the establishment of credit durations for all reported practices something that will need to be worked in? Any BMPs estimated pre-2000 are likely to drop out of the modeling system by 2015, correct?
 - Johnston: Yes, that is a good point. Over the next 6 months, we need to pull together some colleagues to make best professional judgments on BMP credit durations that haven't been determined yet. That is essential to do as soon as possible. Links with a more detailed answer are included in Question 1b of the FAQs.
- Davis-Martin: We are moving to a more recent, and more accurate, land cover data set for the new model. How will that effect our need to report the history of, say, forest buffers? How will we differentiate forest buffers that are already captured in the land use versus ones that were not?
 - Johnston: All BMPs are important to capture, because it is important for funders to know what was done. Also, many land use change BMPs also have an upslope efficiency. Even if you don't get the land use change, you still need the upland efficiency. We still need to collect the BMP data as it stands and let the other rules of the road fill in as we get closer to calibration.
- Davis-Martin: So what we report won't change any land uses but will still give upland efficiency?
 - Sweeney: Correct. It was the same way in the Phase 5.3.2 Watershed Model.
- Sarah Diebold (DoD): I thought the point of the update to the Phase 6 Watershed Model was so we could get better land use data and not have to make those types of assumptions?
 - Johnston: There are a lot of factors that go into the recalibration, and while land use is one factor, BMPs are also important. We need to know the BMPs on the ground everywhere from 1985 to the present.
- Diebold: Federal agencies have BMP calculator spreadsheets, will those be used for this historical cleanup spreadsheet?
 - Johnston: So far states have asked for federal agencies to submit those spreadsheets and the states will convert them to NEIEN ready data. But that is up to the states.
- Diebold: If there are going to be any changes for how to report that historical data, we would like to hear that.

Action: Matt Johnston will add two questions to the FAQ document to address federal spreadsheets and the question of land use changes and their impact on historic data collection.

Action: Send any questions or feedback on the historic data cleanup process to Matt (mjohnston@chesapeakebay.net), Jeff (jsweeney@chesapeakebay.net), or Katherine (Antos.Katherine@epa.gov).

Eastern Shore Nutrient Trends Report – Scott Ator, USGS

- Scott reviewed monitoring data and trends from the recently completed report. It was an informational briefing. The report should be released by January.
 - For more information, please see Scott's [presentation](#).

Discussion:

- Davis-Martin: What is the applicability of this report to regions beyond the eastern shore?
 - Scott Ator (USGS): The dominant transport mechanisms will be similar in other areas, but the importance of groundwater to nitrate transport may be unique to the eastern shore and the numbers may be different in different regions. The geology and hydrology are unique there.
- Volk: We also need to keep in mind the disproportionately large loads coming from the eastern shore. The effect on the bay as a whole is substantial.
- Davis-Martin: We also need to think about this in terms of BMP selection and what will be most effective in the region.

River Input Station Trends Update – Doug Moyer, USGS and Joel Blomquist, USGS

- Doug and Joel provided an update on trends in concentrations and loads from monitoring data collected from river-input stations.
 - For more information, please see Doug and Joel's [presentation](#).

Discussion:

- Currey: When do you expect trends in loads to be available, and will uncertainty be built into the results?
 - Blomquist: We should have a 2014 period of trends in loads in the April timeframe along with the uncertainty analysis. That is a very high priority for us.

Adjourned

Next WQGIT Conference Call:

Monday, January 12, 2015

1:30 pm – 3:30 pm

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
Karl Blankenship	Bay Journal
Marel King	CBC
Beth McGee	CBF
Mary Searing	DDOE
George Onyullo	DDOE
Marty Hurd	DDOE
Lucretia Brown	DDOE
John Schneider	DE DNREC
Ann Baldwin	DE DNREC
Sheryl Quinn	Dept of Navy
Sarah Diebold	Dept. of Defense
Suzanne Trevena	EPA
Dianne McNally	EPA
Reggie Parrish	EPA
Tom Wenz	EPA
Katherine Antos	EPA
Gary Shenk	EPA
Jeff Sweeney	EPA
Ruth Izraeli	EPA
Chris Day	EPA
Greg Allen	EPA, CBPO
Heidi Bonnaffon	HRPDC
Jamie Mitchell	HRSD
Ross Mandel	ICPRB
Bruce Michael	MD DNR
Jason Keppler	MDA
Dinorah Dalmasy	MDE
Lee Curry	MDE
Tom Thornton	MDE
Marya Levelev	MDE
Karl Berger	MWCOG
Owen McDonough	NAHB
Roberta Person	NAVFAC
Marian Norris	NPS
Norm Goulet	NVRC
Ben Sears	NYSDEC
Andy Zemba	PA DEP
Kristin Wolf	PA DEP
Matt Johnston	UMD, CBPO
Sally Claggett	USFS
Doug Moyer	USGS
Jeni Keisman	USGS
Joel Blomquist	USGS
Lisa Ochsenhirt	V(M) AMWA

Jeremy Hanson	VT, CBPO
Alana Hartman	WV DEP
Teresa Koon	WV DEP
Dave Montali	WV DEP
Matt Monroe	WVDA