

**CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM
WATER QUALITY GOAL IMPLEMENTATION TEAM
JANUARY 13, 2014 CONFERENCE CALL
CONFERENCE CALL MINUTES**

ACTION ITEMS AND DECISIONS

ACTION: Lucinda Power will draft a governance document that will detail the WQGIT approval and decision-making processes. WQGIT workgroup leadership will be consulted in the development of this document, given its applicability to workgroup decisions.

WASTEWATER SUPPLEMENTAL INDICATOR DECISION:

DECISION #1: WQGIT recommends to the Management Board that a link will be provided from CBP indicator pages to a new WW indicator to be featured on a website managed by the State of Maryland.

DECISION #2: WQGIT recommends to the Management Board the following “CBP partnership approval” statement be used with the new WW indicator to be featured on a website managed by the State of Maryland:

“The Chesapeake Bay Program Partnership-approved Supplemental Wastewater Indicator is a load-based measure of average annual progress toward the 2025 planning targets for wastewater treatment plants and industrial sources.”

DECISION #3: WQGIT recommends to Management Board the following language be used for the linkage that will be provided from the CBP indicator web pages:

“The Supplemental Wastewater Indicator is a load-based measure of average annual progress toward the 2025 planning targets for wastewater treatment plants and industrial sources. Unlike the Reducing Pollution indicators which report wastewater flows from annual discharge data, this wastewater indicator uses long-term average flows to control for annual variations in weather and hydrological conditions. Since these hydrological influences can cause load fluctuations that exceed restoration efforts in any given year, this indicator was developed as a tool for watershed managers to better understand the effects of their management decisions.”

DECISION #4: WQGIT recommends to the Management Board that the indicator be removed. However, in anticipation that there will be concern about complete removal, the WQGIT also recommends that the page be maintained so that interested users can easily find the information. A link to the new Maryland supplemental indicator will also be available. The WWTWG will discuss what other information users will be linked to in order to replace the current indicator.

ACTION: The previously discussed buffer status paper is now posted on the WQGIT calendar page for comment. Comments should be submitted to Sally Claggett (sclaggett@fs.fed.us).

MINUTES

1. Welcome/Confirm Call Participants and Updates

- Lucinda Power, EPA, welcomed everyone to the call and confirmed call participants.

2. Raising Workgroup Decisions to WQGIT approval

- Lucinda Power (EPA): Recommend that all workgroup issues affecting multiple sectors will be brought to the WQGIT for approval.
 - Following every WQGIT call, a follow up email will be distributed including recent decisions from workgroup meetings.
 - Goal team members are encouraged to coordinate with their colleagues participating in the workgroups as another way to stay informed about current sector issues.
- James Davis-Martin (VADEQ): Recommend outlining WQGIT voting protocols in this governance document. Because WQGIT conference calls are open to the public, recommend that the appointed members (representatives from jurisdictions, all signatories) be the voting members. Or one vote per jurisdictional member and one vote for federal partners, and Chesapeake Bay Commission, etc.
 - Katherine Antos (EPA): In the past, when jurisdiction votes were taken, there has been one vote per jurisdiction among the voting members.
 - Marel Raub (CBC): Recommend seeking WQGIT group consensus in most situations, reserving voting for only when consensus cannot be reached.

ACTION: Lucinda Power will draft a governance document that will detail the WQGIT approval and decision-making processes. WQGIT workgroup leadership will be consulted in the development of this document, given its applicability to workgroup decisions.

- Matt Johnston (UMD): The 2012 Census of Agriculture data is now expected to be available from USDA-NASS in mid to late April. Based on this new data availability timeframe, the land use projections from CBPO are expected to be available in June for Partnership review.
 - James Davis-Martin (VA): Will the final milestone deadline be adjusted because of this change?
 - Suzanne: The milestone deadline will remain May 15th because it has already been pushed back from January. Jurisdictions may revise their milestones once the land use projection data is available.
 - James Davis-Martin (VA): There will be a communication challenge with modifying milestones after May 15th, as well as with evaluating milestones on a different land use than they were created.
 - Suzanne Trevena (EPA): The land use issue can be discussed at the next Milestone Workgroup call.
 - Katherine Antos (EPA): There would be an additional communication issue with having no published milestones.

3. EPA Evaluation of Milestones and Progress – Partnership Coordination

- As a follow up to the December 9th WQGIT call, Suzanne discussed [how EPA will be evaluating final 2013 milestones and progress](#).
- Teresa Koon (WV): Are the progress runs on 2013 land use?
 - Suzanne Trevena (EPA): Initially the 2013 progress runs will be run on 2013 land use.
 - Matt Johnston (UMD): Once this process is complete, the 2013 progress will be run on 2010 land use.

- Lee Currey (MDE): Note that the new BMPs recently approved by the Partnership may affect progress runs and whether or not jurisdictions meet their milestones.
 - Suzanne Trevena (EPA): Multiple factors will be used to evaluate milestones so that none of the jurisdictions are set back just by an update in BMPs.
 - James Davis-Martin (VA): Will the land use projections from the Census of Agriculture affect other sectors?
 - Matt Johnston (UMD): Yes, because the land uses are all connected.
 - Sarah Diebel (DoD): Will the Land Use Workgroup be evaluating this data set, so that jurisdictions have time to review?
 - Matt Johnston (UMD): Jurisdictions will have a chance to review the data.
 - James Davis-Martin (VA): Which other data sets are needed to complete the land use projections?
 - Matt Johnston (UMD): The 2012 Census of Agriculture, adjustments to 2010 Census population information, adjustments from local population estimates, septic data, National Land Cover Dataset. The remaining datasets will be available before the Census of Agriculture.
 - Peter Claggett and Matt Johnston will be on the February agenda to discuss the land use projection schedule in more detail.

4. Wastewater Indicator

- Nita Sylvester (EPA) discussed recommendations for where the new “Partnership-recognized” supplemental indicator could be reported and which agency should calculate the indicator. ([Presentation link](#)) ([Briefing paper link](#)).
 - All indicators are approved by the Management Board and are available under the “Track our Progress” on the Chesapeake Bay Program website.

DECISION #1: WQGIT recommends to the Management Board that a link will be provided from CBP indicator pages to a new WW indicator to be featured on a website managed by the State of Maryland.

- Marel Raub (CBC): Recommend that the language describing the new Wastewater Indicator on Maryland’s website specify “**average** annual progress”.
 - Lee Currey (MDE): Agree with this wording.
- Lee Currey clarified that the WQGIT previously approved of this indicator in December.
- James Davis-Martin (VA): Are other states not using it because they don’t have the data?
 - Ning Zhou (VT): The basic data needed for the indicator exists for all jurisdictions, with the exception of facility upgrade year information.

DECISION #2: WQGIT recommends to the Management Board the following “CBP partnership approval” statement be used with the new WW indicator to be featured on a website managed by the State of Maryland:

“The Chesapeake Bay Program Partnership-approved Supplemental Wastewater Indicator is a load-based measure of average annual progress toward the 2025 planning targets for wastewater treatment plants and industrial sources.”

- Marel Raub (CBC): Recommend specifying “average” before annual progress in the language on the CBP indicator website for consistency.

DECISION #3: WQGIT recommends to the Management Board the following language be used for the linkage that will be provided from the CBP indicator web pages:

“The Supplemental Wastewater Indicator is a load-based measure of average annual progress toward the 2025 planning targets for wastewater treatment plants and industrial sources. Unlike the Reducing Pollution indicators which report wastewater flows from annual discharge data, this wastewater indicator uses long-term average flows to control for annual variations in weather and hydrological conditions. Since these hydrological influences can cause load fluctuations that exceed restoration efforts in any given year, this indicator was developed as a tool for watershed managers to better understand the effects of their management decisions.”

- Nita Sylvester (EPA): EPA plans to continue making this information available without it being an official Bay Program indicator. Based on the current input from the WWTWG, what is the WQGIT recommendation to the Management Board regarding the current “supplemental” wastewater indicator?
 - PA prefers to remove the current “supplemental” wastewater indicator.
 - DE does not have a preference.
 - VA: Will there be a posted indicator for the jurisdictions other than Maryland if the current indicator is removed?
 - Nita Sylvester (EPA): The reducing nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment indicators will be the source for wastewater information.
 - VA: The James River confuses results from the current wastewater indicator and requires additional explanation.
 - Katherine Antos (EPA): Prefer to remove the indicator due to this communication challenge.
 - Beth McGee (CBF): CBF is interested in this information. Request that if the indicator is removed officially, that the information remain easily accessible.
 - WV does not have a preference.
 - MD prefers the new supplemental indicator to the current one, because the new indicator explains fluctuations due to rainfall.
- Nita Sylvester (EPA): The WQGIT will be making a recommendation to the Management Board, which is the group ultimately responsible for indicators.
- Ning Zhou (VT): Note that the current supplemental indicator information is publically available on the EPA database, even if removed from the indicators page.
 - Beth McGee (CBF): Request that an aggregate version of this data be available.
- Ann Swanson (CBC): Recommend including language on the website explaining why the indicator has changed.
- WV: How will users be directed to information for other jurisdictions?
 - Nita Sylvester (EPA): A link on the website will refer users to where the new wastewater indicator information is available.

DECISION #4: WQGIT recommends to the Management Board that the indicator be removed. However, in anticipation that there will be concern about complete removal, the WQGIT also recommends that the page be maintained so that interested users can easily find the information. A link to the new Maryland supplemental indicator will also be available. The WWTWG will discuss what other information users will be linked to in order to replace the current indicator.

5. Model Data Processing Methods

- Mark Dubin (UMD) gave an update on the Agriculture Workgroup's progress toward the Midpoint Assessment priority of model data processing.
- Following the Agricultural Modeling Workshop in May 2013, the Agriculture Workgroup formed a subcommittee to specifically address agricultural modeling questions. The subcommittee's initial task was to review the workshop recommendations and discuss how to address them. The subcommittee is currently working on some of the priorities; other priorities are being addressed by other expert panels within the Agriculture Workgroup. Agriculture Modeling Subcommittee intends to coordinate with the USDA CEAP project to improve CBPO modeling.
- James Davis-Martin (VA): How do these Agriculture Workgroup priorities relate to the Midpoint Assessment priorities defined by the WQGIT in October 2012?
 - Mark Dubin (UMD): These priorities were defined to fulfill the WQGIT priority to improve model data processing methods.
 - Matt Johnston (UMD) clarified that the subcommittee is working on changes to Scenario Builder, which are required for the Midpoint Assessment priority of improving model data inputs.
 - James Davis-Martin (VA): Concerned with setting a different group of priorities. However, there's not a problem as long as these are subtasks related to the larger priority as defined by the WQGIT.
 - Lucinda Power (EPA): The WQGIT priorities from the 2012 meeting are posted on the [WQGIT page](#) under projects and resources.

6. Crediting Conservation Report

- Sally Claggett (USFS): During the October 2013 WQGIT call, the group decided to schedule a discussion of the CBC's June 2013 Crediting Conservation report.
- One option would be to form a working group to discuss off-line the issue in detail and propose appropriate actions back to the WQGIT.
 - Pat Buckley (PA DEP): PA does not believe in credit for a load reduction for conserving lands. PA does not have anyone to nominate that would be qualified to make comments on the report.
 - Katherine Antos (EPA): Recommend comparing priorities already identified in the WQGIT Midpoint Assessment priorities, to avoid duplicating work.
 - Sally and Lucinda will discuss how this issue relates to the goal teams and to the sector workgroups.

ACTION: The previously discussed buffer status paper is now posted on the WQGIT calendar page for comment. Comments should be submitted to Sally Claggett (sclaggett@fs.fed.us).

Adjourned

Next WQGIT Conference Call:

February 10, 2014

1:30 P.M. – 3:30 P.M.

Participants

Russ Baxter (chair)	VA DEQ
Karl Blankenship	Bay Journal
Marel Raub	CBC
Ann Swanson	CBC
Beth McGee	CBF
Mark Dubin	CBPO/UMD
Kim Snell-Zarcone	Conservation PA
Jeremy Hanson	CRC
Emma Giese	CRC
John Schneider	DNREC
Marcia Fox	DNREC
Sarah Diebel	DOD
Ann Carkhuff	EPA
Suzanne Trevena	EPA Region 3
Lucinda Power (Coordinator)	EPA/CBPO
Katherine Antos	EPA/CBPO
Julie Winters	EPA
Jeff Sweeney	EPA/CBPO
Nita Sylvester	EPA/CBPO
Gary Shenk	EPA/CBPO
Dana York	Green Earth Connection
Jamie Mitchell	HRSD
Ross Mandel	ICPRB
Sarah Lane	MD DNR
Bruce Michael	MD DNR
Helen Stewart	MD DNR
Lee Currey	MDE
Dinorah Dalmasy	MDE
Jim George	MDE
Norm Goulet	N. VA Regional Commission
Ben Sears	NY
Patricia Buckley	PA DEP
Ted Tesler	PA DEP
Jim Glancey	U Delaware
Matt Johnston	UMD
David Koran	USACE
Sally Claggett	USFS/CBPO
James Davis-Martin	VADEQ
Eric Aschenbach	VDH

Ning Zhou	VT/CBPO
Teresa Koon	WV DEP
Dave Montali	WV DEP
Matt Monroe	WVDA
Bill Angstadt	Delaware Maryland Agribusiness Association
Paul Emmart	MDE