

SUMMARY
Chesapeake Bay Program
Water Quality Goal Implementation Team (WQGIT) Conference Call
December 10th, 2012, 1:30pm – 3:30pm
<http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/18151/>

DECISIONS & ACTION ITEMS

Follow-up: Information on all current and upcoming BMP Panels can be found on ChesapeakeStat at: http://stat.chesapeakebay.net/?q=node/130&quicktabs_10=3

Action: WQGIT members have been asked to review the October 22-23 WQGIT meeting minutes and provide their comments to Jeremy Hanson (jhanson@chesapeakebay.net) by COB Wednesday, December 19th. Minutes will then be finalized and posted to the WQGIT calendar.

Action: WQGIT members have been asked to consider who from their jurisdiction would be interested in participating in the STAC multiple models workshop scheduled for February 25-26, 2013. Please send participant names to Lewis Linker (llinker@chesapeakebay.net). Lewis Linker will also distribute to the WQGIT members the workshop agenda when finalized. (**Note:** attendance at this meeting may be limited.)

Action: Comments and questions on the USGS Report on Trends in Nutrient & Sediment Loads for the Chesapeake Bay Watershed should be sent to Doug Moyer (dlmoyer@usgs.gov) with a cc to Larry Merrill (merrill.larry@epa.gov) and Lucinda Power (power.lucinda@epa.gov). It will be determined if there's a need to revisit this issue for a future WQGIT call once comments/questions have been received.

Action: Jeremy Hanson will update the October 22-23 WQGIT meeting minutes to reflect that the CBPO Modeling Team no longer needs to provide data criteria for impoundments and reservoirs under STAR's Midpoint Assessment High Priority Work Plan. USGS is planning to provide this information.

Action: Mark Dubin will correct the typo (Sport-basin County) in the Modeling Data Processing High Priority Work Plan.

Decision: A discussion on using 2025 land use data for the Phase III WIPs will be planned during the January 14th WQGIT call.

Action: The Midpoint Assessment High Priority Work Plans for the Modeling Workgroup will be revisited during January's call to ensure there's a common understanding by WQGIT members on the direction these Work Plans are heading.

MINUTES

Welcome and Updates

Larry Merrill (EPA; Chair, WQGIT) convened the call at 1:30PM and reviewed the [agenda](#).

Other announcements from WQGIT members.

- Bruce Michael (MD DNR): Received copy of 2011 Chesapeake Bay annual report. Supposed to provide comments by end of day but is this the absolute deadline?
 - Katherine Antos and Lucinda Power will check.

- Pat Buckley (PA DEP) requested that the issue of developing the Phase III WIPs on a projected 2025 land use year be addressed.
 - Larry: This issue will be discussed during the January 14th WQGIT call.

Follow up from PSC Meeting

- Marel Raub (Chesapeake Bay Commission): The Chesapeake Bay Commission (CBC) is putting together a regional letter to Congress re: the Farm Bill. As of now, we have four states (MD, VA, DE, and WV) who have signed on with the CBC. One item still on the table is the 2012 Farm Bill. The 2008 Farm Bill has expired for the most part. We're not sure of what action will be taken. The letter addresses the fact that the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Initiative has expired and is no longer available to farmers in the watershed, and no existing extension language is in place. The letter recognizes the expiration of the program and looks forward to any potential extension of the program, or how that program might be replaced in the next farm bill.
 - Aaron Ristow (Upper Susquehanna Coalition): What would NY have to do?
 - Raub: We have not received any response from NY. Just shoot Ann or me an email and we just need a signature to insert into the letter.
 - Ron Entringer (NYS DEC): We're drafting our own letter; we're familiar with the farm bill.

Modeling Update

- Gary Shenk (EPA, CBPO): STAC has been focusing on multiple models as they're applied to Chesapeake Bay management. The first meeting back in April looked at the technical aspects. A second meeting will take place February 25-26th in Annapolis. STAC is working on an agenda which will be shared with the WQGIT. The meeting is open to managers and we expect some self selection. If interested, please mark your calendar and consider attending the workshop. Know that there may be some attendance cutoff because of capacity issues.
 - An agenda is available on the STAC event website: http://www.chesapeake.org/stac/workshop.php?activity_id=222
- Shenk: We are working on an extension to the simulation period, as well as simulations to examine the inflow of Conowingo and lower Susquehanna reservoirs. This item will likely be brought before the WQGIT in early 2013 in collaboration with USACE.
- **Action:** WQGIT members have been asked to consider who from their jurisdiction would be interested in participating in the STAC multiple models workshop scheduled for February 25-26, 2013. Please send participant names to Lewis Linker (llinker@chesapeakebay.net). Lewis Linker will also distribute to the WQGIT members the workshop agenda when finalized. (**Note:** attendance at this meeting may be limited.)

USGS Trends Report

- Doug Moyer (U.S. Geological Survey) explained USGS annually provides trend information to the CBPO. This report is a supplement to that.
 - View [Moyer's presentation](#) for more details.
 - Key point: We now have the analytical ability to represent long term changes in water quality conditions as both trends in load and concentration, typically flow adjusted concentration.
 - As flows go up, loads go up. Same with downward. This is a historical way of looking at it.
- Beth McGee (Chesapeake Bay Foundation): The 10%...is there any statistical significance to these results and if not, is that why you picked the 10%?

- Moyer: With this method at this point in time, we do not have a measure of certainty – no statistical significance to these trends. The 10% is a buffer so we're not over interpreting these things. The separation occurs when it's greater than 10%.
- McGee: The ten year, short term trends—are they based on 10 data points? If so, how sensitive is this approach to a high year that might pull the trend upward?
 - Moyer: We could pick any time period so we have 26 years represented. Looked at linear slope.
- Moyer: Interpreting Trend in Load Results: For the most part, the trends are moving in the same direction for trends in load and concentration.
- Moyer: Draft report is nearly ready for release; plan for latter part of this week or sometime next week. Another month after that until we have printed copies. For communication purposes we wanted to present report with all the cooperators. We are also preparing a science summary geared toward water resource managers.
- Merrill: USGS will be briefing the various jurisdictions and agencies. Any key points to raise now?
 - None were raised.
- Merrill: This was a lot of info, appreciate the presentation materials. If you have any specific comments, please contact Doug with a cc to Larry and Lucinda. We will see if there's a need to bring Doug back at a future time for additional discussion.
- **Action:** Comments and questions on the USGS Report on Trends in Nutrient & Sediment Loads for the Chesapeake Bay Watershed should be sent to Doug Moyer (dlmoyer@usgs.gov) with a cc to Larry Merrill (merrill.larry@epa.gov) and Lucinda Power (power.lucinda@epa.gov). It will be determined if there's a need to revisit this issue for a future WQGIT call once comments/questions have been received.

Presentation of MPA High Priority Work Plans

Scientific, Technical Assessment and Reporting (STAR) work plan

- Scott Phillips (USGS): There was a request for more info on trapping capacity behind dams, etc. The first objective is where we would put the most focus in 2013, as it involves a fairly significant partnership approach and utilizing a USACE study. Are there any other issues that need to be incorporated from a modeling perspective?
- Buckley: Is there any analysis with regard to water clarity in the upper Bay to distinguish what is coming from the Conowingo dam or re-suspension in the tidal waters of the Bay?
 - Lewis Linker (EPA, CBPO): The USACE is directing some model runs that would look at the watershed and the water quality standards. We have some scenarios being developed that will address your question.
 - Buckley: Doesn't address the re-suspension of the upper Bay...
 - Linker: So, we would compare the scenarios of Conowingo infill condition under the TMDL or 2010 with those conditions.
 - Buckley: Wasn't aware that the re-suspension modeling wasn't really mature at this point.
 - Linker: The scour of the bottom is not bad. We have a credible simulation.
- Katherine Antos (EPA, CBPO): Re: objectives 2 and 3, at the WQGIT October meeting, some of the jurisdictions were asking how to provide info on impoundments and reservoirs, and an action item from that meeting was for the CBPO modeling team to provide data criteria. But looking at objectives 2 and 3, looks like other workgroups are already pulling this together.
 - Linker: Let's look at what our colleagues at USGS will provide and then see if it's necessary for the CBPO modeling team to provide the data criteria.

- **Action:** Jeremy Hanson will update the October 22-23 WQGIT meeting minutes to reflect that the CBPO Modeling Team no longer needs to provide data criteria for impoundments and reservoirs under STAR's Midpoint Assessment High Priority Work Plan. USGS is planning to provide this information.

Agriculture Workgroup (AgWG) Work Plans

- Mark Dubin (Univ. of Maryland, CBPO; Coordinator, AgWG) described the AgWG work plans:
 - [Modeling baseline](#)
 - [Model data processing](#)
 - [Establishment and update of BMP definitions and efficiencies](#)
- Modeling baseline priority
 - Dubin: Looking at underlying data that goes into the model as baseline conditions to begin the calculation process. We felt that there are some basic data needs that are unmet and could be improved upon. Looking at the assumptions behind those processes. Work plan are based on discussions from Ag Workgroup in Oct and most recent Nov 29th meeting. Ag Workgroup is looking to organize an MPA workshop with the modeling team. The workgroup is interested in holding this early next year. This workshop would be open to others in the Partnership and we would appreciate if you would contact me to let us know your interest. This is a long term effort overall.
- Model Data Processing
 - Dubin: Looking at the process of where in the calculation method you could apply various pieces of information. How do we formulate those calculation methods currently in the model? Linked to previous priority; part of modeling workshop taking place next year. Will require pretty high level of effort, getting into the details. Linked to the baseline data assumptions as well.
- BMP Definitions and Efficiencies:
 - Dubin: Something that we already doing currently through the BMP protocol process. Looking to complete that work in time for 2017 in order to influence Phase 6 modeling structure.
- Matt Johnston (UMD, CBPO; Coordinator, Watershed Technical Workgroup): The Watershed Technical Workgroup (WTWG) was not listed as lead but after discussing it further with the WTWG Chair, Alana Hartman, it seems that the WTWG would serve as the logical go-between for the sector workgroups. The WTWG is happy to be a supporting partner on the technical aspects on these agriculture priorities.
- Antos: For the first priority, the end date was prior to the calibration towards the end of 2016. For a lot of these data sets, the workgroups need to know that the data needs to work in the proper format and be incorporated in the proper format. If we're changing some of these data sources, that could take years. The Ag Workgroup is cognizant of that; keep other workgroups aware of what these changes will be.
 - Dubin: The Ag Workgroup was aware that this was not going to be an easy task to undertake all these efforts. The thought behind having the workshop early in the process is to come out with a fuller work plan and specific tasks that we're going to do. Some things we already have the data for but some will be created from scratch.
- Buckley: Please clarify a point in the modeling data processing work plan. Second page, first section refers to model segments matching county size. Are you going to do that now?
 - Dubin: That was suggested by PA and was part of the Ag workgroup discussions. As we go through the process with the modeling team and the workshop, we'll be able to better quantify what we can and can't do.

- Buckley: What is a “sport basin” County?
 - Dubin: Typo. Not sure what it’s supposed to be. I’ll get back to you on that.
 - **Action:** Mark Dubin will correct the typo (Sport-basin County) in the Modeling Data Processing High Priority Work Plan.

Land Use Workgroup (LUWG) Work Plan

- Jenny Tribo (Hampton Roads Planning District Commission; Co-chair, LUWG): This was a popular topic at the October meeting. As far as schedule, we need to have a final layer to the modeling team by spring of 2015. Hope to have a draft by 2014. Right now, we’re taking an inventory the local data, communicating with jurisdictions and local government to get local land cover data, and working with other workgroups on draft land use categories – hope to get that feedback by February 2013. In the meantime, Peter Claggett will explore the impact of using that local data. Spring - Comparing local data with the acres. Looking at new methods to map the classes.
- Buckley: The WQIT needs to provide the land use workgroup with some direction regarding the land use year that will be used for the Phase III WIPs.
- Merrill: We need to schedule some juncture points and come back to basic question of using 2025. There was a question about PA’s representation on the workgroup. Is PA well represented at LUWG level?
 - Buckley: Yes, we are.
 - **Decision:** A discussion on using 2025 land use data for the Phase III WIPs will be planned during the January 14th WQGIT call.
- Rich Batiuk (EPA, CBPO), regarding Tribo’s point on seeking some resources: We’re putting together a draft RFP for 2013 based on feedback from the Partnership– support for BMP panels and support for land use data. Putting together a cooperative agreement for a consortium for land grant universities, a long term mechanism for our workgroups to tap into. We will also continue the current support from Tetra Tech. Once it’s out on the streets, we’ll share it with the WQGIT.
 - Tanya Spano (Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments; Chair, Wastewater Treatment Workgroup (WWTWG)): Some of the info about assumptions, e.g. septic, will come into play so we [the WWTWG] want to be involved. Let’s use our resources wisely.
- James Davis-Martin (VA Dept. of Conservation and Recreation): During the face to face, we talked about looking at stream network and making sure we have a better representation. Is this something the LUWG will be looking at?
 - Peter Claggett (USGS; Coordinator, LUWG): Yes it is, particularly with riparian forest buffers and characterizing the land use with regards to the stream network.
 - Davis-Martin: It would be great to see where pasture intersects with streams.
 - Claggett: This is on our radar.

Modeling Workgroup work plans

- Lew Linker (EPA, CBPO) presented the Modeling workgroup’s two work plans:
 - [Revise modeling system structure to an all PQUAL model](#)
 - [Revisit watershed model calibration methods](#)
- Linker: There are beginnings of a movement toward a full flow sheet where staff is id’d and start and end dates are identified. Second work plan takes off where the first one – PQUAL – ends. We would like to make sure we have a more rational approach to regional factors. Document the whole work and present this refined Phase 6 model at the end of 2013.

- Davis-Martin: Do we want to submit our feedback to Lew now?
 - Merrill: For the benefit of the full team, have a short description and summary of what you'd like to bring up. The plan for today was to just tee up the work plans. There will be constant feedback. Right now, just a list of concerns for future discussion.
- Davis-Martin: Is this something that the Modeling Workgroup has collectively developed or the staff at the Bay Program?
- Linker: The first step was a straw man draft developed in house, and then it went to the Modeling Workgroup for discussion. This is now a product of the Modeling Workgroup but it is a living document.
- Davis-Martin: Gary Shenk had said he already had a PQUAL version of the model to cross check anomalies in the Ag CHEM results, Next step was to document assumptions in PQUAL version of the model and their sources, to determine if these were the right assumptions to move forward. It seems like we're trying to build the PQUAL model just like AGCHEM.
- Linker: With respect to PQUAL sensitivities, it will be very straightforward. What's happening in the AGCHEM land use and change in load; this is something that we want to document as well. Task 2 is better described as documenting PQUAL and AGCHEM.
- Lee Currey (Maryland Dept. of Environment; Co-chair, Modeling Workgroup): We're not trying to mimic the AGCHEM but one thing we talked about was making sure that using PQUAL, we could simulate the right processes so we could still make management decisions. Trying to explore how to represent the right processes.
- Davis-Martin: That helps, although it seems that the additional evaluation and documentation of AGCHEM is a little out of scope of the MPA if we're determined to move forward with a PQUAL version of the model.
- Linker: If there's something of utility of Phase 5.3.2, then we're going to apply it to the new version.
- Merrill: We'll need to schedule some sort of update in addition to today. This was certainly key from October's discussion and we want to make sure there's a full understanding of the issues involved. Flag this and revisit in January so everyone is comfortable with the direction this Modeling Workgroup is heading.
 - Linker: We'll have an updated assessment after our quarterly meeting in January.

Phase III WIP Schedule work plan – EPA and Modeling Workgroup joint work plan

- Katherine Antos: Priority for co-leads, EPA and Modeling Workgroup. EPA took the first stab but it was reviewed by the Modeling Workgroup and they concurred for moving forward. The schedule is really saying what the process is for the MPA. When would the Phase III WIPs be due? Goal Team had recommended pushing back deadline for WIPs from 2017 to 2018. This was approved by both the Management Board and the PSC. This now means that WIPs will be due in 2018. The appendix to the Guiding Principles was also approved by the PSC and includes some interim actions – model calibration, WIP expectations for Phase III. The only bullet point under interim deadlines is the final one. The appendix to the guiding principles is a living document and the goal team could change it and run it up to the MB and PSC. Will continue work with the workgroups and see if everything is still on schedule, and make adjustments as necessary. Work plan for the schedule is basically done.
- Merrill: Schedule is out there and there is an emphasis to meet those key dates.

Urban Stormwater Workgroup (USWG) work plan

- Norm Goulet (Northern Virginia Regional Commission; Chair, USWG): We will have to displace some BMP Panels in place of this work plan. There are several lower priorities

identified. Idea is to start out this coming year with a completion date of 2015. This date will probably shift. Level of effort is high.

Merrill's closing statement: Good call, lots of information. Commend and thank all the workgroups who put this material together. There are a couple items that need further review in January. Will forward email out to group with summary of key points, action items, and workgroup updates.

Adjourned 3:30pm

Next conference call:

Monday, January 14th, 2013, 1:30pm-3:30pm

<http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/18967/>

Conference Call Participants

Name	Affiliation	Email
Larry Merrill, Chair	EPA, WPD	Merrill.Larry@epamail.epa.gov
Russ Baxter, Vice-Chair	VA DEQ	Russ.Baxter@deq.virginia.gov
Lucinda Power, Coord.	EPA, CBPO	Power.Lucinda@epamail.epa.gov
Jeremy Hanson, Staff	CRC, CBPO	jhanson@chesapeakebay.net
Bill Angstadt	DE/MD Agribusiness Assn.	angstadtconsult@aol.com
Katherine Antos	EPA, CBPO	antos.katherine@epa.gov
Eric Aschenbach	VDH	eric.aschenbach@vdh.virginia.gov
Richard Batiuk	EPA, CBPO	Batiuk.Richard@epamail.epa.gov
Karl Berger	MWCOG	kberger@mwkog.org
Pat Buckley	PA DEP	pbuckley@pa.gov
Collin Burrell	DDOE	collin.burrell@dc.gov
Sally Claggett	USFS	sclaggett@fs.fed.us
Peter Claggett	USGS, CBPO	PClagget@chesapeakebay.net
Lee Currey	MDE	lcurrey@mde.state.md.us
James Davis-Martin	VA DCR	James.Davis-Martin@dcv.virginia.gov
Sarah Diebel	DoD	sarah.diebel@navy.mil
Mark Dubin	UMD, CBPO	mdubin@chesapeakebay.net
Ron Entringer	NY DEC	raentrin@gw.dec.state.ny.us
Katie Foreman	UMCES	kforeman@chesapeakebay.net
Norm Goulet	NVRC	ngoulet@novaregion.org
Rebecca Hanmer	Forestry Workgroup	rwahmer@yahoo.com
Matt Johnston	UMD, CBPO	mjohnston@chesapeakebay.net
Dave Koran	USACE	david.koran@usace.army.mil
Teresa Koon	WV DEP	Teresa.M.Koon@wv.gov
Lewis Linker	EPA, CBPO	Linker.Lewis@epamail.epa.gov
Ross Mandel	ICPRB	Rmandel@icprb.org
Beth McGee	CBF	bmcgee@cbf.org
Kevin McGonigal	SRBC	kmcgonigal@srbc.net
Dianne McNally	EPA, WPD	McNally.Dianne@epamail.epa.gov
Bruce Michael	MD DNR	bmichael@dnr.state.md.us
Matt Monroe	WV DA	mmonroe@ag.state.wv.us
Dave Montali	WV DEP	David.A.Montali@wv.gov
Doug Moyer	USGS	dlmoyer@usgs.gov
George Onyullo	DDOE	george.onyullo@dc.gov
Scott Phillips	USGS	swphilli@usgs.gov

Sheryle	Quinn	DoD	sheryle.quinn@navy.mil
Marel	Raub	CBC	mraub@chesbay.us
Aaron	Ristow	USC	aaronristow@tcswcd.org
John	Schneider	DE DNREC	john.schneider@state.de.us
Tom	Schueler	CSN	tschueler@chesapeakebay.net
Jennifer	Sincock	EPA, WPD	sincock.jennifer@epa.gov
Kim	Snell-Zarcone	Conservation Pennsylvania	kim@conservationpa.org
Tanya	Spano	MWCOG	tspano@mwkog.org
Jenn	Steele	DoD	jennifer.l.steele@navy.mil
Helen	Stewart	MD DNR	hstewart@dnr.state.md.us
Jeff	Sweeney	EPA, CBPO	JSweeney@chesapeakebay.net
Peter	Tango	USGS, CBPO	ptango@chesapeakebay.net
Suzanne	Trevena	EPA, WPD	trevena.suzanne@epa.gov
Jennifer	Tribo	HRPDC	jtribo@hrpdca.gov