

CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM
WATER QUALITY GOAL IMPLEMENTATION TEAM
February 9, 2015 CONFERENCE CALL

MINUTES

Summary of Action and Decision Items

ACTION: WQGIT members should submit their feedback on the STAC uncertainty analysis workshop proposal to James Davis-Martin (james.davis-martin@deq.virginia.gov) by **COB February 19, 2015**.

DECISION: The WQGIT approved the decision to allow states to use the Abandoned Mine Reclamation BMP to offset loads for all extractive areas that are not disturbed for 2015 Progress. Additionally, the WQGIT will direct the Watershed Technical Workgroup to make a recommendation for: 1) Whether or not Erosion and Sediment Control – Construction should be used to treat active extractive areas; 2) establishing a new expert panel if necessary.

ACTION: Scott Phillips will provide a membership list for the Integrated Monitoring Networks Workgroup.

ACTION: WQGIT members should submit their feedback on the Stakeholder Assessment to Frank Dukes (ed7k@virginia.edu) by **COB February 23, 2015**.

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

- Jenn convened the meeting and confirmed call participants.
- Jenn issued a reminder to respond to James Davis-Martin's (Vice-Chair) email regarding the Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) request for workshop proposals. He asked several questions of the WQGIT that could help frame a proposal to conduct a workshop on uncertainty analysis.

ACTION: WQGIT members should submit their feedback on the STAC uncertainty analysis workshop proposal to James Davis-Martin (james.davis-martin@deq.virginia.gov) by **COB February 19, 2015**.

- Davis-Martin: I have included language in the proposal that says it is endorsed by the WQGIT. Is everyone comfortable with that language?
 - There were no objections.
- Volk: I was also sent two other workshop proposals requesting my endorsement, one from the Toxics Contaminants workgroup to focus on PCBs and one from the Habitat GIT to run a workshop on habitat mapping. I endorsed both because I felt they were in support of the Management Strategies. There is also a Scientific Technical Assessment and Reporting (STAR) integrated monitoring proposal that I will respond to shortly. Please let me know as soon as possible if anyone has any issues with these endorsements.

Workgroup Updates:

Land Use Workgroup (LUWG)

- The Land Use Workgroup held a conference call on January 27th.
- They discussed Phase 6.0 land use data and mapping methodologies as well as a timeline of workgroup commitments through 2016.
- Their next meeting will be on February 26th.

Agriculture Workgroup (AgWG)

- The Agriculture Workgroup has a conference call on February 19th.
- They will be discussing Phase 6.0 panel charges, BMP credit durations, agricultural land use loading rates and an update from the Phase 5.3.2 Nutrient Management Panel.
- Their first quarterly face-to-face meeting will be held March 18-19th.

Urban Stormwater Workgroup (USWG)

- The Urban Stormwater Workgroup held a conference call on January 20th.
- They discussed an upcoming STAC workshop on proprietary BMPs, updates to the MS4 overlay, and the Urban Tree Canopy Management Strategy.
- Their next face-to-face meeting will be on February 17th.

Forestry Workgroup (FWG)

- The FWG held a face-to-face meeting on Wednesday, February 4th. The meeting's focus was on the Urban Tree Canopy and Forest Buffer management strategies.

Toxics Workgroup

- Greg Allen, Coordinator for the Toxics Workgroup will be providing a full update during the February 23rd WQGIT call.

Watershed Technical Workgroup (WTWG)

- The WTWG met on February 5th to continue discussing historic data and to review a new default sediment removal rate for the Shoreline Management expert panel report.
- The WTWG is planning to hold a vote on February 13th to determine whether the Shoreline Management report will be approved.
- The next meeting is scheduled for March 5th.

Trading and Offsets Workgroup (TOWG)

- The TOWG met on January 21st to discuss the new Baseline Technical Memorandum. The TM is under revision and is expected to be distributed to the workgroup membership this spring.

Wastewater Treatment Workgroup (WWTWG)

- The WWTWG met on February 3rd to discuss biosolids data and historic data cleanup. They also heard a presentation from the City of Virginia Beach, which has proposed the new BMP: "Boat Pump-Out Facility in a No-Discharge Zone".
- The WWTWG will have their next meeting on March 3rd in order to reach a consensus on a path forward for the historic data cleanup and biosolids data collection efforts.

Modeling Quarterly Meeting Update – Lee Currey, MDE and Dave Montali, WV DEP

- Lee Currey and Dave Montali, Modeling Workgroup Co-Chairs, provided an update from the two Modeling Quarterly meetings that took place in January 2015.
- For more information, please see their [presentation](#).

Discussion:

- Lee Currey (MDE) thanked everyone who participated in the four day meetings. Priorities addressed included the Airshed Model, Watershed Model, Water Quality Sediment Transport Model (WQSTM), TMDL charges, and STAR requests.
- Dianne McNally (EPA): Will we discuss the STAC workshop proposal on uncertainty analysis further on these WQGIT calls? Will it show the uncertainty of meeting the implementation goals?
 - Davis-Martin: The proposal isn't really about conducting an uncertainty analysis, it is about identifying alternative methods and figuring out a process for the partnership to consider with regards to conducting an uncertainty analysis.
- Bruce Michaels (MD DNR): With regards to the Conowingo infill, the contracts are in place to get funding to USGS to do enhanced monitoring and modeling work on sediment transport. That will begin as soon as the weather improves.
- Davis-Martin: How will the most recently issued June 30th requirement for draft submission of historical data map with the timeline presented on slide 5? Do you expect the Scenario Builder and NEIEN component modifications that are being initiated in March to be ready by June 2015 for us to submit this draft historical data?
 - Currey: The process would be in place and Scenario Builder would be ready for October.
- Davis-Martin: I am concerned about the workload associated with that draft submission date requirement especially if the rest of the system is not ready to process it through.
 - Matt Johnston (UMD, CBPO): There is a two and a half month process that we use to work with the states when they submit annual progress. The June 30th deadline is the first submission to NEIEN and I fully expect that not all of the data will be final by then. The bottom line is that by September 30th we need to have all the data into NEIEN for historical BMPs. If we wait all the way until the end of September to get data into NEIEN, we won't have time to QA/QC the data.
 - Davis-Martin: I agree that makes sense, assuming that Scenario Builder and NEIEN are going to be ready.
 - Johnston: Scenario Builder will not be ready in June to take in all the different flavors of BMPs, but NEIEN is ready today.
- Davis-Martin: It sounds like we need to accelerate our efforts to ensure that the Scenario Builder process is expedited so it is ready and we can process the data. Otherwise we haven't accomplished much with the June data submission.
- Volk: Thanked Lee and Dave for their update and asked WQGIT member to send them any other questions or comments.

Annual Progress Reporting – James Davis-Martin, VA and Matt Johnston, UMD

- Virginia is requesting credit for Erosion and Sediment Control (ESC) on Extractive, currently an interim BMP, for annual progress reporting. James Davis-Martin and Matt Johnston reviewed options for crediting this BMP for WQGIT review and decision.
- For more information, please see their [presentation](#).

Discussion:

- Ted Tesler (PA DEP): How would the trampled riparian pasture land use look in the Phase 6 Watershed Model?
 - Johnston: Bill Keeling (VA DEQ), Dave Montali (WV DEP), and I are on an Agricultural Modeling Subcommittee tasked with defining trampled riparian pasture lands differently. Our approach is for it to be less of a land use and instead take a percentage of manure that is supposed to be applied to pasture in the model, and placing it in an area next to the stream. The model then determines how much of that runs off to the stream. With that said, we still want some kind of domain for across the corridor.
 - Tesler: I'm not sure I necessarily agree with that approach, but I understand we need to come up with something.
 - Johnston: It is still a draft and has a ways to go before it is final.
- Tesler: How did the extractive land use get generated in the first place? Is that taken off the satellite imagery?
 - Lew Linker (EPA): I don't recall but I know we have documented this under section 4 of the Phase 5 modeling documentation. I will look into it and send around the link.
 - Post-meeting addition: Linker: The Section 4 - Land Use document lives at the following address:
https://archive.chesapeakebay.net/Modeling/P5Documentation/SECTION_4.pdf
 - Montali: In West Virginia we populated that extractive land use with polygons of our coal mining permit-bonded area.
 - Linker: In section 4.2.6 there is the extractive data layer. Each state was a little different, but for Pennsylvania specifically, the data came from reclaimed or forfeited mines. This is pretty well documented.
- Davis-Martin: So it is showing some inconsistencies as to how this was categorized in different states. Here in Virginia, we provided data on the permitted area as well as the disturbed area and it was the entire permitted area that was classified as extractive. I think we need the Abandoned Mine Reclamation BMP to convert this land to forest, particularly those areas that are not disturbed. I support the process of putting a panel in place to consider this but I want the WQGIT to prioritize this rather than leaving it up to a sector workgroup. I want to make sure that when it comes time to report 2015 progress, I want the report to cover that BMP I said I was going to do.
- McNally: Is one of the options to just use the recommendations from the Erosion and Sediment Control for construction areas BMP panel report and also apply it for active extractive land areas, as long as someone takes a look at it from the WTWG and makes sure it can be applied?
 - Davis-Martin: Yes, that is my preferred approach.
- McNally: But is that better than the interim BMP we have now?
 - Johnston: They actually are identical now because the interim BMP was set to our Erosion and Sediment Control we had in the calibration.
- Montali: Is Virginia okay with going forward with this for 2015 and not going back to 2014?
 - Davis-Martin: 2015 is the milestone year, which is my primary concern.
- Montali: At a minimum, we ought to be able to get something like Abandoned Mine Reclamation on the portion of permitted area that is not disturbed and we ought to be able to get Erosion and Sediment Control on disturbed. If we can do that without jeopardizing calibration of the model, it would be ideal. Mapping all the permitted area to a disturbed state was a wrong decision.
 - Tesler: I agree and support this effort.

- Volk: Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia are comfortable with the recommendation on the screen now but would prefer to avoid convening of a panel?
- George Onyullo (DDOE): I think we need a little coordination to make sure what we determine to be the recommended approach is applicable for both Pennsylvania and Virginia.
 - Davis-Martin: I agree. That is a critical thing to evaluate.
- Montali: The basic idea is for what is not vegetated, you should be able to apply Erosion and Sediment Control for the activities required in the permits.
- Davis-Martin: They are all permitted sites and a condition of all the permits is that they have Erosion and Sediment Control practices in place, so it is a regulatory requirement across the board.
- Volk: It is on our agenda to come to a decision, so I propose for 2015 that states will use the Abandoned Mine Reclamation BMP to offset loads for all extractive areas that are not disturbed. Additionally, we will direct the Watershed Technical Workgroup to make a recommendation for:
 - 1) Whether or not Erosion and Sediment Control – Construction should be used to treat active extractive areas;
 - 2) establishing a new expert panel if necessary.

DECISION: The WQGIT approved the decision to allow states to use the Abandoned Mine Reclamation BMP to offset loads for all extractive areas that are not disturbed for 2015 Progress. Additionally, the WQGIT will direct the Watershed Technical Workgroup to make a recommendation for: 1) Whether or not Erosion and Sediment Control – Construction should be used to treat active extractive areas; 2) establishing a new expert panel if necessary.

USGS Conowingo Report – Mike Langland, USGS

- USGS is releasing a report by early February with updated Conowingo sediment results. Mike Langland outlined the major findings from the USGS Conowingo report.
- For more information, please see Mike's [presentation](#).

Discussion:

- Due to time constraints, WQGIT members were asked to submit any questions to the WQGIT email distribution list.

BASIN Water Quality Report – Scott Phillips, USGS

- Scott briefed the WQGIT on draft findings and recommendations from the upcoming BASIN water quality report.
- For more information, please see Scott's [presentation](#).

Discussion:

- Phillips: A draft of the BASIN report will be shared with the WQGIT sometime in March. I have three requests for the WQGIT membership: 1) Please share your comments on the BASIN report when it is released; 2) Help implement monitoring opportunities by building partnerships and supporting the STAR Integrated Monitoring Networks Workgroup; and 3) Leverage water quality networks to help other Bay Agreement outcomes.

- Davis-Martin: Is there an update on the action item from the WQGIT October face-to-face to add jurisdictional representatives to STAR?
 - Phillips: If a jurisdiction is not participating on the Integrated Monitoring Networks Workgroup, that would be a place where we would like some involvement. We will provide a current membership list and you can participate if interested.

ACTION: Scott Phillips will provide a membership list for the Integrated Monitoring Networks Workgroup.

- Phillips: James, we will reach out to jurisdictions and ask for help on STAR and associated workgroups. It is probably best done through the Management Board so I will talk to Nick DiPasquale (EPA) to get it done.
- Norm Goulet (NVRG): Just a quick comment on Scott's comment about the possibility of using local government monitoring... most of that monitoring is required by, or used to support, permit requirements. Unless the permit regulators show some flexibility, something we've not seen so far, use of that monitoring, or a redirect of those funds, will be limited.

Stakeholder Assessment Work Plan – Frank Dukes, IEN and Katherine Antos, EPA

- Frank Dukes, Institute for Environmental Negotiation, presented the work plan for the stakeholder assessment and requested feedback from WQGIT members.

Discussion:

- Dukes: A contract has been put in place with the University of Virginia Institute for Environmental Negotiations. I have three questions for the WQGIT for which I am requesting feedback: 1) Do you have suggestions for background material to read? 2) Are there any particular questions that you think should be offered? 3) Do you have suggestions for key interviewees?

ACTION: WQGIT members should submit their feedback on the Stakeholder Assessment to Frank Dukes (ed7k@virginia.edu) by **COB February 23, 2015**.

- Davis-Martin: Is this for Phase III WIPs only, or the broader Midpoint Assessment?
 - Dukes: The goal is to ensure that the Phase III WIPs incorporate lessons learned from the previous efforts, but that doesn't mean the information couldn't be used for other purposes.

Adjourn

Next WQGIT Conference Call:

Monday, February 23, 2015
1:00-2:00pm

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
Phillip Brath	ARRO
Seung Ah Byun	Brandywine Conservancy
Marel King	CBC
Kyle Hinson	CRC
George Onyullo	DDOE
John Schneider	DE DNREC
Ann Baldwin	DE DNREC
Gary Shenk	EPA
Suzanne Trevena	EPA
Dianne McNally	EPA
Lew Linker	EPA
Jeff Sweeney	EPA
Ruth Izraeli	EPA
Chris Day	EPA
Katherine Antos	EPA
Jennifer Sincock	EPA
Jamie Mitchell	HRSD
Frank Dukes	IEN
Bruce Michael	MD DNR
Dinorah Dalmasy	MDE
Lee Curry	MDE
Tom Thornton	MDE
Marya Levelev	MDE
Paul Emmart	MDE
Jim George	MDE
Mukhtar Ibrahim	MWCOG
Marian Norris	NPS
Norm Goulet	NVRC
Kristin Wolf	PA DEP
Ted Tesler	PA DEP
Matt Johnston	UMD
Heather Cisar	USACE
Mike Langland	USGS
Joel Blomquist	USGS
Scott Phillips	USGS
Carl Friedrichs	VIMS
Jeremy Hanson	VT, CBPO
Teresa Koon	WV DEP
Dave Montali	WV DEP

Chantal Madray
Jenny Tribo
William Fabey