

Chesapeake Bay Program Partnership's Water Quality Goal Implementation Team October 24-25, 2016 Meeting SUMMARY OF ACTIONS & DECISIONS

ACTION: Chesapeake Bay Program Office (CBPO) staff will share the Local Governments Engagement Initiative's Midpoint Assessment schedule with Water Quality Goal Implementation Team (WQGIT) members and interested parties.

ACTION: It is highly recommended that the WQGIT review the results, (i.e. Model outputs) of incorporating Conowingo, climate change and land use into the next beta version of the Phase 6 modeling tools in the January timeframe, given these are major changes to the Partnership's modeling tools.

ACTION: Lucinda Power will develop a bulleted summary of upcoming WQGIT and Management Board Midpoint Assessment decisions (similar to the two page summary of upcoming Principals' Staff Committee Midpoint Assessment decisions).

DECISION: The WQGIT agreed to recommend to the Management Board that the Partnership apply the same methodological approach to establishing the Phase III WIP planning targets as was used by the partners in the development of the jurisdictions' major river basin allocations under the 2010 Chesapeake Bay TMDL, recognizing the need to update the No Action and Everything by Everyone Everywhere (E3) scenarios as well as estimates of relative effectiveness to reflect the Partnership's suite of Phase 6 models and greatly expanded list of Partnership-approved BMPs.

DECISION: The WQGIT agreed to recommend to the Management Board that the Partnership continue to make allowances for special cases and consideration of special circumstances, for example those provided to New York, West Virginia and Virginia's James under the original set of 2010 Chesapeake Bay TMDL decision rules, during the Partnership's development of Phase III WIP planning targets. These adjustments are intended to allow for adjustments to the allocation methodology necessary to meet local WQ standards or to ensure the partnership's principals of equity and fairness are met.

ACTION: The CBPO Modeling Team will post on the Modeling Workgroup's website the detailed data output results (e.g., all sources and all scales) from the scenarios presented to the WQGIT that compared runs through the Beta 3 versions of the Partnership's suite of models with runs through the 5.3.2 models.

ACTION: WQGIT members are asked to review the various data visualization tools presented and provide feedback to John Wolf (jwolf@chesapeakebay.net) on recommended enhancements to and expansion of the data visualization and other functionality of these tools by COB November 23, 2016.

ACTION: Olivia Devereux will provide a listing of fixed/corrections that have been made to the Phase 6 Watershed Model Beta Versions data input visualization tools and post this listing in the documentation

section of the appropriate web page(s). **Update:** The data visualization application for the Phase 6 model inputs has been updated to include a list of data and functionality upgrades:

<https://mpa.chesapeakebay.net/Phase6DataVisualization.html>

ACTION: WQGIT members should continue to review Phase 6 Model inputs, using the data visualization tool presented by Olivia Devereux, and contact Matt Johnston (mjohnston@chesapeakebay.net) with any questions or comments.

DECISION: The WQGIT agreed on the proposed path forward as described by John Wolf for better visualizing model scenario outputs from the full suite of Partnership models, specifically, by using a comparative approach (Phase 5.3.2 to Phase 6) for next beta and final versions of the models.

ACTION: The Modeling Workgroup will oversee the running of the 2015 Progress scenario, as well as some form of the Bay TMDL and/or Phase II planning targets scenarios through the most recent beta version of the Partnership's suite of models by the CBPO Modeling Team.

DECISION: The WQGIT agreed that we currently have an understandable story to tell about the effect of the infill of Conowingo Dam and Reservoir on Chesapeake Bay water quality.

ACTION: CBPO staff will develop a briefing document including the range of six options for allocating the additional loads as a result of the infill of Conowingo Dam and Reservoir for WQGIT approval and presentation to the Management Board in advance of its November 17th meeting.

ACTION: During its November 14th conference call, the WQGIT will work to reach consensus agreement on a recommendation on its preferred option for allocating the additional loads resulting from the infill of Conowingo Dam and Reservoir for presentation to the Management Board at its November 17th meeting.

DECISION: The WQGIT agreed on the Modeling Workgroup's proposed modeling approach for simulating the infill of Conowingo Dam and Reservoir in the Partnership's full suite of Phase 6 modeling tools. The Conowingo Dam and Reservoir's trapping of nutrients and sediment would be turned 'on' for pre-2000 years, and turned 'off' for post-2000 years. The default condition for future progress scenarios and most management scenario would be for Conowingo Dam and Reservoir trapping to be turned 'off'.

ACTION: Peter Claggett will work with Mary Gattis to schedule a presentation on the 2025 forecasted conditions for the Partnership's Local Government Advisory Committee.

DECISION: The WQGIT agreed on the Land Use Workgroup's recommended timeline and process for reaching a decision on whether to use 2025 forecasted conditions in the Phase III WIPs by Spring 2017, including presentations to the WQGIT of the estimated 2025 growth in loads for each of the seven jurisdictions in the January/February 2017 timeframe as well as the proposed methodology for crediting conservation of land. EPA clarified that the jurisdictions' use of 2025 forecasted conditions in the Phase III WIPs would satisfy EPA's expectation for accounting for growth.

ACTION: Mary Gattis will explore options for linking work on the Local Government Engagement Initiative with the Scientific, Technical, Assessment and Reporting (STAR) Team's Integrated Trends Analysis Team (ITAT) explaining trends work to identify these localized success stories and directions for further development of the presented data visualization tools.

DECISION: The WQGIT agreed to the proposed process for having the ITAT Jurisdictional Team lead the Partnership through the continued development and communication of the explanation of the observed trends long term in tidal and watershed water quality and biological resource monitoring in order to help better inform management actions.

ACTION: Over the next three months, the Modeling Workgroup will provide the WQGIT with their best quantification of uncertainty around the simulated effects of climate change on modeled watershed loads and Chesapeake Bay water quality responses based on 2025 and 2050 climate change estimates.

DECISION: The WQGIT agreed to recommend to the Management Board that the Partnership adopt the Climate Resiliency Workgroup's proposed range of options for when and how to factor climate change considerations into the Mid-point Assessment in preparation for final decisions in spring 2017.

DECISION: The WQGIT agreed on the Climate Resiliency Workgroup's proposed next steps, timeline and upcoming climate change related Partnership decisions (PSC approval dates listed below):

- **December 2016*:** Proposed climate change assessment procedures.
- **December 2016*:** Proposed ranges of options for when and how to factor climate change considerations into the jurisdictions Phase III WIPs with decisions in spring 2017 informed by the outcomes of the proposed climate change assessment procedures.
- **May 2017*:** When and how to incorporate climate change considerations into the Phase III WIPs as the partners work on the draft Phase III WIP planning targets due in June 2017.
- **December 2017:** Final Phase III WIP planning targets fully reflect partnership decision regarding how and when to incorporate climate change considerations.

DECISION: The WQGIT agreed to recommend to the Management Board that:

- The WQGIT agreed to use the term "Local Planning Goals" instead of "Local Area Targets";
- Local planning goals should be established at a scale below the State-major river basin;
- The WQGIT's Local Planning Goals Task Force will develop language to address concerns over the transfer of accountability to local jurisdictions, using the language from the Partnership's Federal Facility Targets Protocols as a template. Additional language will be added to the Task Force question 1 recommendation.
- Jurisdictions retain full flexibility in how they delineate local scale and define local planning goals in accordance with task for recommendations for Question 2;
- Local planning goals be expressed in one or more of the ways as defined by the Task Force in their recommendation for Question 3; and
- The Task Force's revised recommendations will be presented to the WQGIT for approval in December and incorporated directly as written into EPA's January 2017 revised draft Phase III WIP Expectations document.

ACTION: The WQGIT requested that the Watershed Technical Workgroup further consider and development of recommendations for the data collection, verification and potential reporting in NEIEN of manufactured treatment devices (MTDs). Data will not be used for progress reporting or receive model credit at this time.

DECISION: The WQGIT agreed to extend the deadline for submission of all Phase 6 model inputs to December 31, 2016 including the jurisdictions' submission of historical BMP data and the source sector

workgroups' submission of final BMP expert panel reports which directly impact Phase 6 model calibration. BMP expert panel reports submitted to and approved by the WQGIT after the December 31, 2016 deadline will be available to partners for crediting the BMPs through the Phase 6 suite of models starting in 2017.

ACTION: The WQGIT will seek a decision on the revised Phase 6 Nutrient Management BMP Expert Panel's final report during their November 14th conference call in order to accommodate Pennsylvania's request for more time to consider the Agriculture Workgroup's approved amendments to the Panel's final report. [Based on a poll of the WQGIT members participating in the October 24-25 meeting in person and on the conference call line, all of the remaining members indicated their support for approval of the Panel's final report.]

DECISION: The WQGIT agreed to proceed forward with an updated Phase 6 version of the Partnership's Everything by Everybody Everywhere (E3) scenario based on the following:

- Additional work is needed to characterize the "E3" scenario. The TMDL includes multiple contradictory characterizations of the scenario.
- Approval of application of the more rigorous, originally proposed urban stormwater E3 scenario components developed by the Urban Stormwater Workgroup's Chair and Coordinator and presented to the WQGIT;
- Approval of application of the proposed updated agriculture E3 scenario components previously approved by the Agriculture Workgroup and presented to the WQGIT, with the recognition that:
 - Further updates may be made based on approval by the Agriculture Workgroup as new information is available on manure transport BMPs and the Phase 6 land cover and land use data; and
 - The Agriculture Workgroup will work with the Forestry Workgroup to enhance the domain of acres eligible for forestry BMPs under the agriculture and forestry E3 scenario components;
- Approval of application of the proposed updated wastewater treatment E3 scenario components previously approved by the Wastewater Treatment Workgroup and presented to the WQGIT;
- Agreement on the need to add missing E3 scenario components for shoreline management and in-situ BMPs (i.e. algal flow way technologies, oyster aquaculture).

ACTION: CBPO staff will work with the Habitat GIT chair and coordinator as well as the appropriate workgroup chairs to define the missing E3 scenario components for shoreline management and in-situ BMPs (i.e. algal flow way technologies, oyster aquaculture).

ACTION: The WQGIT will schedule a future discussion on the wastewater treatment decision rules for the Phase III WIP planning target methodology—whether to change the total nitrogen concentrations of 4.5 mg/L and 8 mg/L and the total phosphorus concentrations of 0.22 mg/L and 0.54 mg/L which define the two wastewater treatment 'hockey stick' lines within the existing methodology to better reflect the more recently reported concentrations by hundreds of municipal wastewater treatment facilities across the watershed and the new E3 definition developed by the Wastewater Workgroup.