

CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM
WATER QUALITY GOAL IMPLEMENTATION TEAM
October 20, 2014 CONFERENCE CALL
MEETING SUMMARY

ACTION ITEMS AND DECISIONS

DECISION: WQGIT approved the path forward and an understanding of the future decisions needed to determine how and when the partnership will incorporate consideration of climate change conditions within WIP implementation.

ACTION: Please send fatal flaw comments to the decision making structure and leads for the midpoint assessment priorities to Lucinda Power (power.lucinda@epa.gov) by November 3rd.

ACTION: Submit recommendations on WQGIT climate change priorities to Jenn Volk (jennvolk@udel.edu) or Scott Phillips (swphilli@usgs.gov).

ACTION: The sector workgroups will review the CAST suite of tools with regards to BMP lifespans to see how the jurisdictions defined them and what information the jurisdictions provided.

ACTION: Sector workgroups will work with CBPO staff to schedule presentations on BMP lifespan considerations at upcoming workgroup meetings.

MINUTES

Welcome/Confirm Call Participants – Jenn Volk, Chair

- Jenn Volk, Chair (University of Delaware), welcomed everyone to the call and verified participants.

Climate Change Presentation and Discussion – Lew Linker, EPA

- Lew Linker (EPA, CBPO) reviewed the tools being developed to quantify the effects of changes in watershed flows, storm intensity, and changes in hypoxia due to increased temperature and sea level rise in the estuary.
 - For more information, please see Lew's [presentation](#).

Discussion:

- Tanya Spano (MWCOG): How is the Bay Program going to coordinate with other parallel climate change estimate efforts?
 - Lew: STAR has the lead on climate change in the broadest aspects. The Bay Program's Modeling Workgroup has its hands full and is leaving the rest to STAR.
 - Jenn Volk: Scott Phillips (USGS/STAR) would like each of the Goal Implementation Teams to provide their list of climate change priorities to STAR.

If you have thoughts, let us know by sending us an email. STAR will have a call for membership related to climate change issues during their meeting on Thursday.

- Gary Shenk (EPA/CBPO): There will be a climate change coordinator through NOAA, and the academic community is heavily engaged. The Modeling Workgroup has their hands full, so they are trying to coordinate with the academic community to get as much information from them as possible.
- Tanya: I recommend we complete an evaluation of who is doing what with regards to climate change studies, and that those efforts are coordinated to ensure consistency in the assumptions being used.
- Dave Montali (WV DEP): Scott's request is probably related to the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement outcomes, which has a lot to do with monitoring and assessment. There are some topics in the Agreement that the Modeling team will not get into, such as the BMPs that are resilient to climate change.

ACTION: Submit recommendations on WQGIT climate change priorities to Jenn Volk (jennvolk@udel.edu) or Scott Phillips (swphilli@usgs.gov).

- Slide 19 of Lew's [presentation](#) outlines the tasks planned and schedule.
- Dianne McNally (EPA): Part of our objective is to figure out where all the work being done fits into our Phase 3 WIP planning. I ask that we develop a schedule that incorporates all of these climate change action items and outcomes into the Phase 3 WIP planning.
 - Lucinda Power (EPA/CBPO): We want to ensure priority timelines match up to the calibration timeline. We are working now on merging those timelines into one critical path schedule, and climate change considerations will be involved in that process.
- Tanya Spano: I would like to reinforce the need for coordination. One of the charges to STAR should be to identify key assumptions and differences between different groups doing similar research. The Water Quality Goal Implementation Team (WQGIT) needs to understand where there may be differences in key assumptions, and where there are agreements.
 - Lew Linker: I would characterize the Modeling Workgroup's work as having a complete assessment on a limited area of climate change impacts.
- Dave Montali: We need to have all our tools in place before we can contemplate a 2050 scenario. The question is when we should roll out that 2050 scenario to be used in our developed tools? It would seem to me to be the second half of 2016 or early 2017.
 - Lew Linker: Yes, that sounds correct.
- James Davis-Martin (VA DEQ): That raises a scheduling concern. The first few items on your list may require changes to some of the Watershed Model assumptions. For example, would we need to add in new projections on rainfall, for example? How do we build those into the model for 2015 if we don't have this work completed until 2016?
 - Lew Linker: I think we are alright. We can track changes in intensity with data from 1985-2011 in order to increase the relative intensity at a 2050 level. The

Phase 6 Watershed Model will be going forward as described and this would be a separate track.

- James Davis-Martin: So some decisions before 2015 would change assumptions to reflect climate change? Those are Modeling Workgroup decisions?
 - Lew Linker: On the technical side, yes, but some of the implications, especially in terms of policy, would affect the other groups and a number of the goal teams.
- James Davis-Martin: Will these untreatable load increases that we recognize occur? How do we account for actions taken to try and mitigate the effects of climate change?
 - Lew Linker: We need to take this step by step. We still need to answer the question of how big of a problem this is.
- Tanya Spano: If the cumulative effect of all these factors could make our jobs harder, how do we address that in our policies, regardless of what factor is actually driving the change? Will you do sensitivity analyses? It is important to focus on when we will have problems and the magnitude of the problems.
 - Lew Linker: I think that is a great idea. We need to know the influence of the different factors, and that is a type of sensitivity analysis. We will be building the sensitivity as we are building the overall model.
- Tanya Spano: Rather than getting caught in the weeds of the technical details, like rainfall patterns and exactly how many feet the increase will be, we need to stay focused on the big picture. The big picture is that we end up in the same place, with a big problem.

DECISION: WQGIT approved the path forward and an understanding of the future decisions needed to determine how and when the partnership will incorporate consideration of climate change conditions within WIP implementation.

Federal Facility Targets – Jim Edward, EPA and James Davis-Martin, VA

- James Davis-Martin, Vice-Chair (VA DEQ), and Jim Edward (EPA) reviewed the Federal Facility Targets [proposal](#). Approval of the proposal will be sought during the November 10 WQGIT conference call in preparation for the November 13 Management Board meeting.
- Jim Edward: This report is the result of a Management Board request to find out how we can get federal facilities to do a better job on BMP progress reporting. The idea is to try to make use of the BayFAST tool. There are 9 key components to the approach for setting targets for federal facilities, outlined in the [document](#).

Discussion:

- James Davis-Martin: Based on priorities set in the 2015 milestones, Virginia decided to focus only on the largest facilities (greater than 500 acres) that make up about 90% of loads.
- James Davis-Martin: What we need is for federal facilities to be involved and participating in the planning. Should that be incorporated in this document as well? I

wonder if what is outlined here is enough, since this is similar to what we did last time and got very little response.

- Jenn Volk: There was an emphasis from both the Management Board and the PSC on making sure that the federal facilities were using the jurisdiction-approved verification protocol.
 - Jim Edward: We will incorporate that into the next draft of this document.
- Jim Edward: The plan now is to go to the November 13 Management Board meeting and December PSC meeting with this approach.
- Tom Thornton (MDE): It seems like a very sensible approach. The BayFAST tool will be critical to making this work. We need federal facilities understanding of their land uses in the tool. One missing step is that facilities will have to do their BMP inventory and compare them to something like a no action scenario so that they can set a plan for how to move themselves towards their target.
 - Jim Edward: The BMP inventory definitely makes sense. There does need to be a base they're working from. We will add that in.
- James Davis-Martin: I believe the way BayFAST is going to work is that each facility will have to develop an individual scenario. Is there an easier way for states to extract their land uses other than having to go into BayFAST and open 75 individual scenarios to pool data?
 - Olivia Devereux (Devereux Consulting): We have the ability to merge scenarios, so you could put all those federal facilities together into one.
 - James Davis-Martin: But once I merge them, I would no longer have unique land use characteristics for each of them.
 - Gary Shenk: So you are looking for an algorithm to be present in BayFAST to make those calculations based on a set of rules. It just depends on priorities, what you are talking about would be possible, but we will need to do some hand calculations to see how we would want to proceed with that.
 - James Davis-Martin: I think that is a way to proceed. I would suggest adding a little more wiggle room to step #5 in this proposal to allow the use of other tools for collecting the information.
 - Jenn Volk: Would that suggestion be represented in this strawman document?
 - James Davis-Martin: No, but it is a suggested modification before it comes back for approval.
- Sarah Diebel (DoD): In 2010 the Department of Defense provided land use information on our database facilities and it is disconcerting that that info was not included in BayFAST. We commented on possible changes to update BayFAST with land uses we had already provided. That would help in changing the way the Watershed Model assumes federal lands are distributed. Make sure there is some level of consistency across the jurisdictions.
 - Jim Edward: We will strive to make that consistency happen.
- Sarah Diebel: The Department of Defense has made strides in providing BMP information, and I think we should be recognized to the Management Board for areas

where improvements have been made rather than just being told what we are not doing. We would also like to hear a prioritized list of which federal facilities are being looked at.

BMP Lifespan Considerations – Matt Johnston, UMD

- Matt Johnston (UMD/CBPO) presented on how lifespans might fit into BMP verification and NEIEN, and about possible actions needed to incorporate lifespan considerations into the modeling tools for the midpoint assessment.
- For more information, please see Matt's [presentation](#).

Discussion:

- Matt Johnston: I recommend a full review of these lifespans by the Water Quality GIT and the workgroups. The ones provided for cost benefit analysis data review are very long.
- James Davis-Martin: One big assumption in those BMP lifespans is that there would be ongoing operation and maintenance costs, which is why the lifespans are so long. Urban practices set much shorter lifespans.
 - Tom Wenz (EPA): Kevin Debell (EPA) could tell you the full set of values he has assigned to BMP lifespans.
- Jenn Volk: According to the BMP protocol, don't the BMP expert panels look at defining the useful life of the practice? If not, that would be a good thing for them to look at.
 - Matt Johnston: To date, some panels look at that. From the Watershed Technical Workgroup side, everyone has been hesitant to take a step out into verification because they wanted to see how the framework was reviewed.
 - Jeremy Hanson (Virginia Tech): Now that we know more about the approved BMP verification guidance, the panels can address lifespans since it is included in the BMP Protocol.
- Dave Montali: In the verification framework, there is a direct point that all sector workgroups must define the practical lifespans for all approved BMPs. That needs to be done quickly, not in 2016-17, but maybe next summer so that when states are developing their verification programs, they have that information.
- Rebecca Hanmer: You must make a distinction between physical lifespans and credit lifespans. In the Forestry Workgroup, we addressed recertification in the contract rather than actual physical functionality.
- Matt Johnston: Should inspection be the same as maintenance or is maintenance better in terms of the model? Our default idea is that proof of either would result in an equal extension of credit in the model.
- Norm Goulet (Northern Virginia Regional Commission): As the Urban Stormwater Workgroup went through the expert panels, we were being told that verification is a state prerogative. The workgroup could only initially make recommendations on the lifespan, not how often it needs to be maintained to continue to function at the load reduction defined.

- Rebecca Hanmer: In the verification framework, we said the Watershed Technical Workgroup would do the lifespan guidance, but for new BMPs, the expert panels would define the lifespans. I suggest an analysis be done on the need for guidance for the states.
- Norm Goulet: The problem is that the workgroups only provided guidance and the states will make decisions individually.

ACTION: The sector workgroups will review the CAST suite of tools with regards to BMP lifespans to see how the states defined them and what information they provided.

- Matt Johnston reviewed the following list of recommended action items:
 1. Charge source sector workgroups to determine if partial lifespan renewal is warranted upon receipt of inspection date. This would likely vary across BMPs.
 2. Charge WTWG to consider how subsampling of BMPs for verification might be incorporated into NEIEN.
 3. Charge WTWG to work with Modeling Workgroup to determine how lifespans should be modeled during calibration.
- Norm Goulet: I would request the presentation be cleaned up and provided to the Urban Stormwater Workgroup in November.
 - Seconded by other workgroups.

ACTION: Sector workgroups will work with CBPO staff to schedule presentations on BMP lifespan considerations at upcoming workgroup meetings.

- Mark Dubin (UMD/CBPO): Maybe we can look at work the nutrient trading program has already done on this subject, at least in the agricultural sector.

PSC December Meeting Prep – Lucinda Power, EPA

- Lucinda Power, WQGIT Coordinator (EPA/CBPO), reviewed midpoint assessment priorities and issues that require Management Board and PSC input and decision. For more information, see the [document](#) on MPA priorities and decision leads.

Discussion:

- Tanya Spano: If something is complete, can you demonstrate how to find that decision?
 - Lucinda Power: Yes, I can include a link to the associated work plan.
- Dianne McNally (EPA): Was one of the action items from the WQGIT's Face to Face meetings for Lucinda to develop a complete schedule?
 - Lucinda Power: That was a critical path forward schedule; the specific priority under the midpoint assessment was to align the Phase 3 WIP and Mid-Point Assessment schedules, which was approved by the PSC.
- Jenn Volk: This document will be sent out by Lucinda in an email for further WQGIT review.

ACTION: Please send fatal flaw comments on the decision making structure and leads for the midpoint assessment priorities to Lucinda Power (power.lucinda@epa.gov) by November 3.

Adjourn

List of Call Participants

Member Name	Affiliation
Jenn Volk	University of Delaware
James Davis-Martin	VA DEQ
Lucinda Power	EPA/CBPO
David Wood	CRC/CBPO
Emma Giese	CRC/CBPO
Ann Carkuff	EPA
Ben Coverdale	DE Dept. of Agriculture
Ben Sears	NYDEC
Beth McGee	CBF
Chris Day	EPA
David Montali	WV DEP
Dianne McNally	EPA
Dinorah Dalmasy	MDE
Gary Shenk	EPA/CBPO
George Onyullo	DDOE
Jason Keppler	MDA
Jeff Sweeney	EPA/CBPO
Jen Sincock	EPA
Jenny Tribo	HRPDC
Jeremy Hanson	VT
Jim Edward	EPA
Julie Winters	EPA
Kristen Wolf	PA DEP
Lew Linker	EPA/CBPO
Lindsay Dodd	MD Association of Soil Conservation Districts
Marel King	CBC
Matt Johnston	UMD/CBPO
Olivia Devereux	Devereux Consulting
Paul Emmart	MDE
Rebecca Hanmer	EPA
Ross Mandel	ICPRB
Russ Baxter	VA Office of Natural Resources
Ruth Izreali	EPA
Sarah Diebel	DoD
Steve Han	PMAA

Tanya Spano	MWCOG
Ted Tesler	PA DEP
Teresa Koon	WV DEP
Tom Wenz	EPA