CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM
WATER QUALITY GOAL IMPLEMENTATION TEAM
July 23, 2018 Meeting Minutes
Meeting Materials: Link

Actions and Decisions:

ACTION: Joan Smedinghoff will edit labels and formatting of the Final Phase III WIP Planning Targets document for clarity and post to the website. Michelle Williams will distribute the updated table to the WQGIT by email and update the calendar page.
ACTION: David Wood will update the Conservation Landscaping Interim BMP Table of efficiency values with a 50% conservative reduction and distribute to the WQGIT prior to the decision request for this interim BMP in August.

ACTION: Michelle Williams will distribute the BMP Expert Panel Report regarding Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems to the WQGIT for review prior to the request for interim BMP approval next month.

1:00 **Welcome/Confirm Call Participants/Workgroup Updates** –WQGIT Co-Chairs

- Note: Lucinda Power, Teresa Koon, and Dianne McNally were unable to join the call; Lew Linker, Dave Montali, and Suzanne Trevena served as alternates, respectively.
- Review of Draft Actions and Decisions from July 9 PSC meeting (planning targets, Phase 6 final corrections) – Dinorah Dalmasy, MDE (WQGIT Co-Chair)
  - The PSC approved by consensus the implementation of the recommended corrections and changes to the Partnership's Phase 6 suite of models as identified by CBPO and the jurisdictions. NY representatives were asked to "stand aside" on the approval of the corrections, citing the need for more review time.
  - The PSC unanimously approved the proposed final Phase III WIP planning targets for nitrogen and phosphorus. NY and WV agreed to take on responsibility for the proposed contribution from PA's load reductions and split it equally between the two jurisdictions. MD and VA provided pounds of N from their respective reduced load reductions.
  - The PSC approved the recommended resolution to concerns raised by Delaware and Maryland on agricultural tax ditches in the Partnership's Phase 6 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Model.
  - The PSC agreed that the jurisdictions' Phase III WIP nitrogen and phosphorus planning targets will remain unchanged through 2025, recognizing that the PSC reserves the right to revisit this decision if necessary.
  - The PSC agreed that the Partnership will make no further changes to the Phase 6 Model until the end of 2019, in advance of the 2020-2021 milestones, when decisions on any model changes would be made by the Partnership.
  - The PSC approved the revisions to the Phase III WIP development schedule as presented (draft Phase III WIPs posted on jurisdictions' websites by April 12, 2019; Final Phase III WIPs posted on jurisdictions' websites by August 9, 2019).
- SRS updates on management strategies and workplan revisions for water quality outcomes (2017 and 2025 WIPs, water quality standards attainment and monitoring, toxic

contaminants research, toxic contaminants policy and prevention, and forest buffers) – Allie Wagner (WQGIT Staffer)

- WQGIT management strategies and workplan revisions are currently underway. The revisions will be brought back to the WQGIT in August for review. Key dates can be found on the SRS Timeline.

- Review of GIT project ideas which were submitted for Chesapeake Bay Trust peer review, next steps for GIT project voting, and selection for final RFP process – Allie Wagner (WQGIT Staffer)
  - The submitted project proposals moving forward:
    1. Urban Stormwater Workgroup-Stream Health Workgroup: "Bay-wide Forums to Promote Implementation of Enhanced Stream Restoration Practices" (Contact Norm Goulet, NoVA Regional Commission: ngoulet@novaregion.org)
    2. Toxic Contaminants Workgroup: "Pavement Sealant Protocol Development: Identifying New High-PAH Pollution Sources" (Contact Lillian Power, DC DOEE: Lillian.power@dc.gov)
    3. Water Quality Assessment and Monitoring: "Pilot a Dissolved Oxygen Vertical Monitoring System to Characterize Spatial Extent of Hypoxia" (Contact Peter Tango, USGS: ptango@chesapeakebay.net)
  - Key dates moving forward can be found on the GIT Funding Timeline.
- Reminder to send feedback to Jeremy Hanson (jchanson@vt.edu) regarding the proposed membership for the Animal Mortality Management BMP Expert Panel by COB 7/31. Materials for review can be found on the AgWG Calendar Page.
- The GIT discussed the Final WIP III Planning Target Tables, and recommended changes to formatting and labels to improve clarity.

ACTION: Joan Smedinghoff will edit labels and formatting of the Final Phase III WIP Planning Targets document for clarity and post to the website. Michelle Williams will distribute the updated table to the WQGIT by email and update the calendar page.

1:20 **Interim BMPs for inclusion in Phase 6 Modeling Tools: Conservation Landscaping Practices** –David Wood, CSN

David briefed the WQGIT on the proposal and technical appendix for homeowner conservation landscaping practices for inclusion in the Phase 6 modeling tools as an interim BMP.

Discussion:

- Note: The efficiency values provided in the table will be amended to include a 50% conservative reduction as recommended by the WTWG. This would change the efficiency values to a 39% reduction in N and a 25% reduction in P.
- Lew Linker: When we have a 78% reduction of N beyond turf grass, are we in danger of getting loads lower than a natural forest for example?
  - David Wood: The group felt those numbers were too high for planning purposes, so they will be divided in half for a more conservative efficiency.
- Dave Montali asked for clarification regarding the two methods for credit, specifically the run-on treatment portion.

    - David Wood: This allows for a small amount of impervious cover treatment from the adjacent impervious cover area that runs on. You would report acres of impervious cover that run onto the conservation landscaping area and that would be credited against impervious cover land use, with the same percentages as the ones applied for the conversion. There is a cap of a 2:1 ratio on that, since there are limitations with capacity. These would be additive to the efficiency values in the table. I plan to work with CBP modeling staff to include an example of reporting in the technical appendix.
- James Davis-Martin: What exactly is meant by the term "adjacent"?
    - David Wood: Adjacent means anywhere in the contributing drainage area.

ACTION: David Wood will update the Conservation Landscaping Interim BMP Table of efficiency values with a 50% conservative reduction and distribute to the WQGIT prior to the decision request for this interim BMP in August.

1:45 **Interim BMPs for Inclusion in Phase 6 Modeling Tools: Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems** – Marcia Degen, TetraTech, and Vic D'Amato, TetraTech
Marcia Degen and Vic D'Amato briefed the WQGIT on the Expert Panel recommendations and WTWG-approved technical appendix for including drip irrigation dispersal practices for onsite wastewater treatment practices as an interim BMP in the Phase 6 modeling tools.

Discussion:

- Note: This BMP already has an expert panel convened. The report has been reviewed and presented to WTWG and WWTG. This will be brought back for approval next month.
- Dinorah: Will the report be distributed to the group?
    - Marcia Degan: Yes, it certainly can be distributed.

ACTION: Michelle Williams will distribute the BMP Expert Panel Report regarding Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems to the WQGIT for review prior to the request for interim BMP approval next month.

2:10 **Interim BMPs for Inclusion in Phase 6 Modeling Tools: Boat Pump-Out Practices** – Vic D'Amato, TetraTech
Vic D'Amato will brief the WQGIT on the Expert Panel recommendations and WTWG-approved technical appendix for inclusion of boat pump-out practices in the Phase 6 modeling tools.

Discussion:

- James Davis-Martin: The report says you used MD and VA boat registration data by counties, were coast guard registered vessels taken into consideration as well?
    - Lew Linker: No, we did not include those.
    - James Davis-Martin: That may account for many of the larger vessels which may be the most frequent use and highest potential for MSD discharges.
- James Davis-Martin: I noticed that in MD, the assumption was 30.8% of boats from 16-21 feet and 88% of boats greater than 42 feet, have the ability to use pump-out facilities. For VA, 58% of boats 26-40 feet and all boats greater than 40 feet can use pump-out

facilities. What is the difference between MD and VA boats pump-out stations that makes these values so different?
    - Vic D'Amato: I'd have to go back and look more in depth, my guess is this information was in our data sources, most likely the survey data. This is a good point to consider.
- James Davis-Martin: The presentation led me to believe that credit for pump-outs would be given to the county in which the vessel is registered. Why is that the case, instead of the station where pump-outs were made?
    - Vic D'Amato: Boat registration data was not limited to coastal counties or counties with shorelines, so we used broader registration data and reallocated it to counties with coastal bay shoreline.
    - Lew Linker: We haven't put those details together yet in the technical appendix. These values are so low, it may not make a big difference. It may be easiest to take it throughout the county, but could do either way. The locations of the pump-outs are not very resolved in terms of magnitude of waste removed. All of this will be addressed in the technical appendix.
- Tanya Spano: As we pursue these small scale BMPs, it makes a big difference if data used to propose numbers are bay-wide or small localities. As a protocol, there should be lessons learned from all of the new localized practices to make it clear where in the process these BMPs are when brought to the WQGIT. Another issue is how we incentivize these for localities to bridge issues with local and bay-wide incentives. We need to keep people on a more local level involved in the process.
    - Lew: It is an important consideration how localized the credit will get, maybe to counties. The important point is the level of effort in these specialized loads needs to be measured. We can address many of these limitations in the technical appendix such as coastguard registry, and transients.
- Norm: I agree with comments about level of effort, but there has to be enough effort for us to get these in the model since there is so much emphasis on other BMPs in terms of research. The point made about coast guard registry is valid. It can't only be pleasure boats, but also commercial vessels that we consider. In PA, there are a significant amount of registered boats that also need to be considered. The way the boat sizes are laid out, just won't work because most of those vessels are on the small side. Those boats have porto-potties, which are illegal to dump into marine area. We are talking about a discharge that is illegal, and we need to work with EPA to figure this out. As far as crediting, the load is an estuarine marine load, not a watershed load. Yet, we will be taking that load of out of the watershed load as we credit the localities. The credit needs to be taken in the county where it is pumped out. I see many technical problems with this BMP.
    - Lew Linker: As far as the large vessels, they have type 1 and type 2, which is legal to discharge nutrients.
    - Norm Goulet: A cruise ship for example, it will treat for coliform, but it is not treating for nutrients. It treats and discharges immediately.
- Sarah Diebel: James and Norm have very valid comments. Are you only considering stationary pump-out locations? I know there are a number of new companies that will go to you instead of a stationary location.
    - Vic D'Amato: Yes, we are only considering stationary pump-outs.

- Lew Linker: The thrust of this expert panel was looking at recreational boats that we would have control over, not these large vessels.
    - James Davis-Martin: I disagree, I think it is boats in no discharge zones, which applies to all classes of vessels.
- Sarah Diebel: I don't understand how this would be used as an interim BMP for planning purposes. What load source is this being applied to? There is a load for the estuary system and then this BMP coming out of the watershed load. This does not make sense.
    - Lew Linker: Boat discharges are not to the watershed, it's to the tidal waters of the bay. The goal is to give communities with programs some credit for reducing some nutrient load. Just like shoreline management or oysters, we would do tracking at the edge of shoreline loads from the watershed. The load reductions are happening in the estuary, but we do tracking at water's edge for accounting.

2:35 **Interim BMPs for Inclusion in Phase 6 Modeling Tools: Denitrifying Bioreactors** – Loretta Collins, UMD

Loretta briefed the WQGIT on the Expert Panel recommendations and technical appendix to include agricultural ditch bioreactors as an interim BMP in the Phase 6 modeling tools.

Discussion:

- Note: The agricultural ditch management expert panel is in progress. They are aiming for an expert panel report to be out by end of August or September. This interim BMP practice has been approved for planning purposes at the AgWG and WTWG.
- Beth McGee: It would be helpful if references were included the technical appendix. From what I've seen in research on this, it is very important to size these appropriately. If there is a lot of bypass, it would not be treating all of that. Was there discussion on the assumption that all water will be treated?
    - Jeff Sweeney: That 20% accounts for the fact that there is bypass. If there was no bypass, and all water was treated, the effectiveness could be as high as 90% reduction in N. The group's recommendation is considerably lower than that to account for overflow over certain times of the year.
    - Clint Gill: Regarding the sizing, we generally go by the NRCS practice codes.

3:00 **Interim BMPs for Inclusion in Phase 6 Modeling Tools: Saturated Buffers in Tile Drainage Agricultural Areas** –Loretta Collins, UMD

Loretta briefed the WQGIT on the Expert Panel recommendations and technical appendix to include saturated buffers as an interim BMP in the Phase 6 modeling tools.

Discussion:

- Note: Bypass flow is already accounted for in the efficiency value. This practice would be reported as either the length of saturated buffer or area of saturated buffer with an assumption of 1 buffer acre treating 10 upslope acres. If only length is reported, a 30ft wide buffer will be assumed according to NRCS standards.
- Beth McGee: The 20% efficiency seems lower than a regular buffer. Is this lower than what we are giving for existing buffers, or is this in addition to an existing buffer?
    - Jeff Sweeney: It's lower than a typical buffer, but treatment area is considerably higher than grass buffers. This is their best estimate at this point in the panel process.

- Dave Montali: Would this saturated buffer be reported separately from another buffer? So you couldn't report both, it is one or the other?
    - Loretta Collins: Yes, that is correct.

Call Participants:

Dinorah Dalmasy, MDE
James Davis-Martin, VA DEQ
Lew Linker, EPA CBPO (alternate for WQGIT Coordinator)
Michelle Williams, CRC
Allie Wagner, CRC
Brittany Sturgis, DNREC
Marcia Fox, DNREC
Clint Gill, DDA
Cassandra Davis, NYSDEC
Dave Montali, TetraTech (alternate for West Virginia)
Marcia Degan, VDH
Ray Tighe, VDH
George Onyullo, DOEE
Ed Dunne, DOEE
Lauren Townley, NYS DEC
Marel King, CBC
Adrienne Kotula, CBC
Suzanne Trevena (alternate for EPA R3)
Lindsay Thompson, MDAG
Beth McGee, CBF
Jenn Volk, UDel
Tanya Spano, MWCOG
Sarah Diebel, DOD
Loretta Collins, UMD
Norm Goulet, NoVA Regional Commission
Karl Berger, MWCOG
Jeff Sweeney, EPA CBPO
Greg Allen, EPA CBPO
Mary Gattis, LGAC
Joan Smedinghoff, Alliance for the Bay
David Wood, CSN
Jeremy Hanson, VT
Gary Shenk, USGS
Bruce Michael, MD DNR
Karl Blankenship, Bay Journal