

CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM WATER QUALITY GOAL IMPLEMENTATION TEAM

October 12, 2017 CALL SUMMARY

[Meeting Page](#)

Summary of Actions and Decisions:

Action: The Modeling Workgroup will brief the WQGIT periodically during WQGIT conference calls on progress towards finalizing the Phase 6 suite of modeling tools and analyzing key scenarios in preparation for making recommendations on Phase III WIP planning targets at the December 4-5 Modeling/WQGIT Face-to-Face meeting.

Action: The WQGIT will be briefed at an upcoming WQGIT conference call on 2025 agriculture forecasting data (available in Phase 6 CAST) from Matt Johnston, AMS coordinator.

Decision: The WQGIT approved the key decisions and actions following the Face-to-Face meeting, with the following edits: the slides for assimilative capacity analyses will be updated to reflect all the scenarios for assimilative capacity that the WQGIT wants to review: Conowingo on and off, climate change on and off, and both on and off. When local planning goal(s) are referred to, a parenthesis will be used to indicate that local planning goal(s) can be a single goal.

Action: Lucinda Power will confer with the Modeling Workgroup on how best to address issues of transparency in the review of the draft planning targets, and present options/recommendations on an upcoming WQGIT conference call.

Action: WQGIT members interested in providing preliminary user feedback on developing data visualization tools for review of the Phase 6 geographic isolation run results should contact Michelle Williams (williams.michelle@epa.gov) and Emily Trentacoste (trentacoste.emily@epa.gov).

Action: A schedule for development and review of special cases will be developed and included in the overall schedule for review and finalization of the draft Phase III WIP planning targets.

Action: Lucinda Power will incorporate the requested changes to the planning targets review process and timeline briefing paper and circulate the updated draft to the WQGIT for review. This document will be approved at an upcoming WQGIT conference call.

Welcome/Confirm Call Participants/Workgroup Updates – James Davis-Martin, WQGIT Chair

- James Davis-Martin: We will have 3 at-large seats for election or re-election coming up at the end of the year.
 - Sarah Diebel: Which seats are those?
 - Davis-Martin: Last year's appointees were Tanya Spano, Chris Thompson, Sarah Diebel, so Jenn Volk, Beth McGee, and Bill Angstadt's seats will need to be filled. We will try for early January 2018 to do those nominations.

- Lucinda Power: There will be an airshed modeling webinar on October 31. Information is available on the [calendar page](#).
- Lew Linker: We have a brief update from the CBPO Modeling Team. We have made a schedule for finalizing the models in time for the PSC retreat in December. I have brief updates today on the Watershed Model (WSM) and the Water Quality Sediment Transport Model (WQSTM).
 - Watershed Model (WSM): We have all the inputs and have finished the auto-recalibration, and now we need to do hand calibrations. On Nov 1-8, we will produce key scenarios on the final Phase 6 WSM.
 - Water Quality Sediment Transport Model (WQSTM): The final calibration is complete, and chlorophyll predictions have improved. Our model is now more sensitive to hypoxia observations. We will be going over the final model at our Modeling Quarterly meeting and will start running the September versions of the WSM inputs on the final WQSTM. We expect to see less hypoxia and more attainment than we saw at the September Face-to-Face version of the model. We can bring that information to the WQGIT on October 23.
 - Davis-Martin: Our group would like to have regular updates at our upcoming meetings as you have time in your schedule. We would also like to build in more time to go over substantial findings from the Modeling Team during our calls as we prepare for December.
 - Linker: We can certainly do that.
- Diebel: Are we using the regular WQGIT calls to go over this, or will we have a December Face-to-Face before the PSC meeting?
 - Davis-Martin: We are looking at the first week in December for a Face-to-Face meeting—2 days, offsite.
 - Power: We are looking at December 4-5 or Dec 5-6. We will do that with both the Modeling workgroup and the WQGIT. We are discussing with Crowne Plaza in Annapolis, and their preferred date is December 4-5. We looked at MDE, but they don't have available space. NCTC is also unavailable that week. If we aren't able to book the Crowne Plaza, then we may look at hotels in PA or the Baltimore area.
 - Davis-Martin: That will be a joint meeting with the Modeling group and the WQGIT. We will be reviewing the new data and decide how to refine our recommendations or make new ones based on the new data.

Action: The Modeling Workgroup will brief the WQGIT periodically during WQGIT conference calls on progress towards finalizing the Phase 6 suite of modeling tools and analyzing key scenarios in preparation for making recommendations on Phase III WIP planning targets at the December 4-5 Modeling/WQGIT Face-to-Face meeting.

Review of Outcomes from October 3 PSC Meeting— James Davis-Martin, WQGIT Chair and Lucinda Power, WQGIT Coordinator

James and Lucinda briefed the WQGIT on [outcomes](#) from the October 3 PSC meeting. Recommendations included: postponement of some issues from the October PSC retreat to the December PSC meeting, including a 6-week change in schedule to finalize the Phase 6 modeling tools, to release the draft Phase III WIP planning targets, and to develop the Phase III WIPs.

- Lauren Townley: The deadline to submit special cases, is that also May 7, 2018?
 - Power: April 20 is the deadline, because that informs the development of the final planning targets.
 - Davis-Martin: April 20 is the deadline, but we should be discussing those special cases as a Partnership as soon as they are ready to be discussed.
- Diebel: We discussed special cases in PA, are there criteria that trigger the need to request special cases, or is it more subjective?
 - Power: We can point to the TMDL special cases, but we don't have any specific criteria to consider or grant special cases, so expanding on that definition and schedule is a good idea. When we discuss the review process for planning targets we can make sure to add in that consideration.
 - Davis-Martin: We can certainly clarify the special cases issue when we come to that in the Phase III WIP planning targets review process.
- Dave Montali: We will need a couple months ahead of May 7 to review and get WQGIT concurrence on special cases. How will this work with special cases submitted April 20 and release the planning targets a week or two later? Can we develop a sub-schedule for special cases?
- Davis-Martin: From December 22, 2017, there needs to be some internal review and analysis for jurisdictions to even know that they need to request special cases.
- Dinorah Dalmasy: What about the EPA's final expectations document?
 - Power: The final document will be released following the December PSC retreat, in order to reflect policy decisions made at that retreat.

Review of WQGIT Face-to-Face Actions and Decisions—Lucinda Power, WQGIT Coordinator

Lucinda presented a [summary](#) of actions, decisions, recommendations, and next steps following the September 25-26 WQGIT Face-to-Face meeting.

- James Davis-Martin summarized the Face-to-Face actions and decisions.
- Sarah Diebel asked about availability of 2025 growth scenarios.
 - Davis-Martin: The data on historical trends is available in CAST, but current zoning is still in progress, and will be finished by November 15. That will be in CAST by January 2018.
 - Ed Dunne: We are still waiting on GIS and tabular data for current zoning in DC, so please make a note of that.
- Davis-Martin: We have alternative future scenarios in development, and we will try to get 'Conservation Plus' (formerly 'Utopian') done by January 15, 2018 to be in CAST in

March 2018. 'Zoning Plus' will require more data collection, so that could take more time.

- Dianne McNally: The language for the climate change options will be revised to reflect our recommendation, right? Element C does state that states will prioritize climate resilient BMPs in their WIPs. Element C might then be redundant with Element B.
 - Davis-Martin: The distinction is that one is an adaptive management approach, and the other calls for the WIPs to include a prioritization based on established climate resiliency. Similar language is also in the sample narrative that the CRWG has started to develop.
 - Diebel: What I got from the Face-to-Face was that the data just wasn't there yet to prioritize BMPs in that way.
 - Tanya Spano: That was the point, and what we were concerned about is that we don't want to prescribe or imply that judgement can be made on data that doesn't exist.
- Jim George: This issue is related to the effort to incorporate Watershed Agreement outcomes into the WIPs.
 - Davis-Martin: Nicki Kasi is leading a group from the Management Board to develop a WIP guidance template to include those considerations into the WIP development process and eventual WIP narratives. We will hear more about that from Nicki in early November.
- Davis-Martin: I remember that Beth McGee dissented on the qualitative approach. The rest of us agreed that a qualitative approach at minimum was appropriate, but didn't Beth support a qualitative approach only if the quantitative approach was also adopted?
 - Power: She said she did support the qualitative approach, but it's unclear as to CBF's position on this issue.
 - Davis-Martin: So we may be closer to consensus on this issue than we think.
 - Montali: I remember she was uncomfortable but she did stand aside for the decision.
 - Diebel: I'm unclear at this point where that decision stands.
 - Power: We will be able to call again for consensus on the October 23 call once we review the updated language from the CRWG. (Edit: The discussion on climate change policy options has been postponed to November 13).
- Davis-Martin: While the PSC did not make a decision on climate change, they did seem supportive of taking element A and making it relevant to jurisdictions' flexibility as well.
- Diebel: Will there be two areas to address quantitative approaches, one with a 2025 scenario and one with 2050, or did we agree on one year to plan for?
 - Power: We will look at climate change using a 2025 projection. We can revisit that, but the runs that will be done by December will focus on 2025.
- Ted Tesler: Can we add parentheses for local planning goal(s) to show that it could be a single goal?
 - Power: Yes, we can do that.
- Davis-Martin: I spoke with Bruce Michael from LGAC about the permit for Exelon. The permits are very careful about prescribing how to comply with regulations, but they only

tell them what they have to do, not how to do it. It may have to be less specific if this is to be included as a permit condition.

- Diebel: Are there processes outside of the Bay Program that might have innovative strategies for making those reductions? Maybe that should be included in future recommendations on identifying new BMPs and what the science says about those reductions.
 - Davis-Martin: Who were you thinking who has developed these concepts?
 - Diebel: There is a pilot study on dredging, and there is a need to identify how the dredging would impact the needed reductions. Will there be some discussion on what those innovative strategies might be on reducing some of that additional load?
 - Davis-Martin: There is some discussion on quantifying what the additional load is coming into the reservoir, and there is some work on identifying a conversion factor for the annual load and impacts from dredging.
 - Bruce Michael: We will be working with Army Corps of Engineers and we will develop an estimate as to what the dredging work might mean in terms of sediment and phosphorus loads and impacts to Bay water quality goals.
 - Diebel: I don't want there to be the paper work exercise that we have to go through to certify new practices. Is there another way to bypass the red tape that we have for approving BMPs, related to the Conowingo infill issue?
- Davis-Martin: There was another comment during our SAG meeting. If we have this local planning goal approach, for BMP implementation reporting going forward, how should we credit that implementation? Is that split between the two pots of load between the planning targets and the local planning goal? Or is one prioritized over another in terms of applying the reductions? This is assuming it will be adopted by the PSC.
- Davis-Martin: There was also discussion of doing the geo runs again, is that happening?
 - Power: Yes, that will be done.
- Davis-Martin: We need to see the assimilative capacity from Conowingo and climate change.
 - Power: We will look at each on and off, and we will also look at assimilative capacity with both on.
- Davis-Martin: The current zoning scenario with land use change: where is the animal and crop mix coming from for 2025 forecasts? Is that data available for Partnership review?
 - Jeff Sweeney: It's all there under Base Conditions for 2025 land use for the 'Historic Trends' scenario.
 - Davis-Martin: So that data will not change for current zoning scenarios?
 - Sweeney: The Ag land uses will change, so that will shift a little bit on the scenarios.
- Davis-Martin: Does the WQGIT want to have a presentation on this input, or would you rather review in CAST?
 - George Onyullo: It won't hurt to present this to the WQGIT.
 - Davis-Martin: I would like to have this presented.
 - Brittany Sturgis agreed.

- Bill Angstadt agreed.
- Sweeney: Matt Johnston (AMS coordinator) can present the results to the WQGIT, but the decisions on how to do this forecast was made by the AgWG and AMS.

Action: The WQGIT will be briefed during an upcoming WQGIT conference call on 2025 agriculture forecasting data (available in Phase 6 CAST) from Matt Johnston, AMS coordinator.

Decision: The WQGIT approved the key decisions and actions following the Face-to-Face meeting, with the following edits: the slides for assimilative capacity analyses will be updated to reflect all the scenarios for assimilative capacity that the WQGIT wants to review: Conowingo on and off, climate change on and off, and both on and off. When local planning goal(s) are referred to, a parenthesis will be used to indicate that local planning goal(s) can be a single goal.

Planning Target Review Process and Timeline –James Davis-Martin, WQGIT Chair; Lucinda Power, WQGIT Coordinator; and Emily Trentacoste, EPA

James and Lucinda [presented](#) the white paper from the WQGIT Face-to-Face Meeting on the draft Phase III WIP planning targets review process and timeline. Emily will also call for a small group of volunteers to provide input on the development of the visualization tools for reviewing the geographic isolation runs (options for the data visualization tools will be presented by John Wolf to the WQGIT on October 23).

- Power: This document introduces the process for reviewing the planning targets, and we will also introduce the consideration that Dave Montali suggested, to include consideration of special case requests.
- Power: Specifically, we want to review the changes to level of effort and planning targets based on policy decisions on climate change and Conowingo. We also have options for developing local planning goals numerically or programmatically—below the state basin level—that’s up to the jurisdictions to define and determine how best to address local goals.
- Power: We will also have several trainings by Olivia Devereux on how to use CAST, and information from Emily Trentacoste to evaluate geo runs and data to develop local planning goals.
- Davis-Martin: We need to make a decision today on having the interim step on preliminary proposals requesting special cases for Feb 28—we want to have preliminary notifications of special case requests to the Partnership?
 - Montali concurred: We may not have the exact numbers yet, but we can give advanced notice of what our expectations and justifications are for the coming request. And then we’d need the next month to fine tune that for the April 20 deadline.
 - Davis-Martin: The justification is also important, and can be evaluated with the information you will have available this winter. That is appropriate to bring to the WQGIT and tee up for the PSC.

- Tesler: It's too early to commit at this point.
 - Davis-Martin: Can we keep it as a goal? The absolute deadline is April 20 and we can aim for Feb 28.
 - Tesler: There are a lot of things that still need to happen for that, so I suppose there's time to aim for that but I don't know at this point.
 - Power: I will revise the language to say that the goal is to advise the GIT of coming special case requests by Feb 28 and the final deadline is April 20. I can revise that and send out the WQGIT for final review.
 - Davis-Martin: The second bullet there that jurisdictions are encouraged to initiate dialogue—we can build that out in the revisions.
 - Power: I can revise that but we should have some interim dates and processes in mind. We will also have data visualization tools that will be available to assist in the review of the planning targets.
- Emily Trentacoste: Geo runs are used to develop relative effectiveness which are used to develop the planning targets. Our web team wants to do basic user research in terms of what is most useful to you as end users. John Wolf will be presenting options and ideas at the October 23 WQGIT call, and we want feedback from the GIT on what you want to see. What non-jurisdictional reps are on the line that want to volunteer for user feedback?
 - Tanya Spano volunteered: Especially interested in what might be most useful to local governments.
 - Bill Angstadt volunteered
 - Mary Gattis volunteered
- Angstadt: In the Phase 6 review, we had a lot of transparency in comments and responses. Will we have that in the review of the draft planning targets during our 4-month review?
 - Davis-Martin: The review is a Partnership review even though it most impacts the jurisdictions. I hope that everyone will take part. Since the planning targets will translate to dollars spent in reductions, so we may not want to make everything that transparent.
- Montali: If WV needs a special case, then that will be brought to the WQGIT. We won't be hiding anything but we will have to justify our needs and responsibilities to the Partnership anyway, so I don't think we need a whole transparency process.
- Davis-Martin: Is there a suggestion to modify this document to make sure transparency is ensured?
 - Angstadt: There was a divide and conquer approach, and now we have a lot of issues that goes into establishing the planning targets. When we go from watershed wide to local areas, what is the process for identifying and fixing fatal flaws or addressing inquiries or incorporating better data, especially at the local level?
- Davis-Martin: So a process for receiving and documenting comments and having that available somewhere? We can make sure to capture those and catalogue for public consumption?

- Diebel: I liked having the Phase 6 catalog of comments, so that if we had issues then that promoted collaboration in developing solutions. But that contradicts what James was saying in that we don't want to make this all completely public.
- Power: I don't know if we should be comparing this review to the Phase 6 fatal flaw review, since those had different goals. We will confer with the modeling team to address the transparency issue in the best way. We want to leave a lot of discretion to jurisdictions in this review and we just want to coordinate and facilitate rather than prescribe. We will come back with a proposal to see how best to address the transparency issue.
- Tesler: It's good sometimes to have closed work to focus the work, but it's important to have public understanding and buy-in. At the same time, a lot of this process is closed door meetings and negotiations on the planning targets between the states and EPA. We need both private exploration and appropriate public access.
- Spano: We need to differentiate between any and all exploration of options and issues that might be sensitive in nature. If there are problems or issues with the runs or the modeling, then we need to make sure we are making that information available.
- Davis-Martin: There is a networking of ideas that also could be useful.
- Angstadt: We need a clear delineation and justification as to what discussions and topics we will keep private and which we will be able to make public. One of my concerns is source sector allocations. We don't want a jurisdiction to determine arbitrarily that some share of loads should go unfairly to one source sector over another.

Action: Lucinda Power will confer with the Modeling Workgroup on how best to address issues of transparency in the review of the draft planning targets, and present options/recommendations on an upcoming WQGIT conference call.

Action: WQGIT members interested in providing preliminary user feedback on developing data visualization tools for review of the Phase 6 geographic isolation run results should contact Michelle Williams (williams.michelle@epa.gov) and Emily Trentacoste (trentacoste.emily@epa.gov).

Action: A schedule for development and review of special cases will be developed and included in the overall schedule for review and finalization of the draft Phase III WIP planning targets.

Action: Lucinda Power will incorporate the requested changes to the planning targets review process and timeline briefing paper and circulate the updated draft to the WQGIT for review. This document will be approved at an upcoming WQGIT conference call.

2:30 Adjourned

Call Participants:

James Davis-Martin, VA DEQ, Chair

Teresa Koon, WV DEP, Vice Chair
Lucinda Power, EPA CBPO, Coordinator
Lindsey Gordon, CRC, Staffer
Michelle Williams, CRC, Staffer
Emily Dekar, USC
Lauren Townley, NYS DEC
Brittany Sturgis, DNREC
Dinorah Dalmasy, MDE
Emily Trentacoste, EPA CBPO
George Onyullo, DC DOEE
Ed Dunne, DC DOEE
Jenn Volk, U Delaware
Ted Tesler, PA DEP, WTWG Chair—filling in for Nicki
Dave Montali, WV, TT
Ann Jennings, CBC
Dianne McNally, EPA R3
Bill Angstadt
Sarah Diebel, DOD
Tanya Spano, MWCOG
Mary Gattis, LGAC
Lew Linker, EPA CBPO/Modeling Workgroup
Joan Smedinghoff, CRC
Alisha Mulkey, MDA
Norm Goulet, NoVA Regional Commission/USWG Chair
Kelly Gable, EPA R3
Barry France, NRCS
Bruce Michael, MDNR
Chris Thompson, Lancaster County Soil Conservation District
Chris Day, EPA R3
Jeff Sweeney, EPA CBPO
Jeremy Hanson, VT