

WIP Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting
Maryland Department of Natural Resources
Conference Room C-1
April 18, 2011

Members

Bob Boxwell - Lower Potomac Tributary Team
Julie Pippel – Upper Potomac Tributary Team
Moira Croghan - (alternate for Jamie Brunkower Sassafras River Keeper)
Rupert Rossetti - Tributary Team
Don Outen - Baltimore County and Maryland Sustainable Forestry Council
Carlton Haywood – Chair and Middle Potomac Tributary Team
Terry Matthews - State Water Quality Advisory Committee (SWQAC)
Jen Aiosa - Chesapeake Bay Foundation (CBF)
Jen Dindinger – Choptank Tributary Team
Katie Malonie - Maryland State Homebuilders Association
Valery Connelly - Maryland Farm Bureau
Ginger Ellis – Lower Western Shore Tributary Team
Lynne Hoot - Maryland Association of Soil Conservation Districts (MASCD)
Candace Donoho - Maryland Municipal League (MML)
Bill Satterfield - Delmarva Poultry Industry Inc

Staff

Ken Yetman – DNR
Lee Currey – MDE
Jeff Horan – DNR
Tom Thornton – MDE
Frank Dawson – DNR
Catherine Shanks - DNR

Others

Sara Taylor Rogers – SWQAC Alternate

Meeting Summary

Note – MDE presentations were also recorded for a prior webinar and can be viewed at the following link https://mddnr.ilinc.com/perl/ilinc/lms/vc_launch.pl?activity_id=rrwyvkj&user_id=

PDFs of the MDE presentations are on the MDE Website

<http://www.mde.state.md.us/programs/Water/TMDL/TMDLImplementation/Pages/PhaseIIBayWIPDev.aspx>

Carlton Haywood, Chair, opened the meeting with introductions

Jim George from MDE presented the status of the development of the local teams. In addition, monthly webinars are scheduled on technical topics. The first one was held in April covering the same presentations as those given today.

Discussion:

Q. Will we provide numbers at a higher scale when the final numbers come out in July? Will financing be set to meet the targets?

A. Numbers from the 5.3.3 model will be able to be provided at a segment scale or county scale as most appropriate or useful at the local level. Funding needs to be part of the discussion and mechanisms to address funding needs should be included in the strategies and milestones.

Comment: Growth allocation for WWTPs will provide a cushion for NPS reductions to meet 2020 targets since growth allocation will not be met by 2020. Non-point Sources will need to continue to reduce to maintain the reductions. Growth allocation will not be in areas where Agricultural NPS targets need to be met. State needs to assess how we meet the load allocations for the Bay while developing local plans to meet local targets. MS4 permits will also need to be met.

Q. Will counties be asked to submit actions on a segment level or county scale?

A. Currently data is collected on a count/major basin scale which is the scale for local planning. Local plans can work at a smaller scale if they choose.

Q. How do we make sure the WIP planning does not discourage finer scale planning.

A. Our intent is that the local plans can be added up to address the state wide scale needs but that may not be achievable given the timeframe. Land use differences between the local data and the Bay model may also be an issue that will need to be reconciled.

Q. Would 2 year milestones be used to direct actions to meet 2020 goals?

A. 2 year milestones should reflect changes in capacity needs to address programmatic changes as well as implementation actions.

The members requested the liaison lists to SAC. (attached) The members also requested the Teams contact list to SAC with Team leader if they exist. *Note: Some teams are still forming and reluctant to distribute membership lists. Instead, the local Team leader has been provided as a contact.* Municipalities and private interests are interested in participating in local teams but have not been contacted in some cases.

Lee Currey from MDE presented an overview of the MAST Tool. This tool will provide local WIP Teams with the ability to evaluate scenarios and strategies to meet the loading allocations for the County scale

Discussion:

Q. How are multiple practices on an agricultural fields addressed in the tool?

A. Ag practices treatment train are addressed in the efficiencies assuming several practices would be used together. Using percentages keeps input over available acreage from being applied. It allows for multiple practices on the same acreages depending on the type of practice. This is an estimate of the model and provides a good approximation.

Q. Are cost estimates included in the tool?

- A. Need to be able to provide cost information aligned or as part of the MAST tool. MDE considering developing a contract for providing costs and financing options for output from MAST scenarios.
- Q. Will this product be public?
- A. This is currently under discussion because of access and update questions. EPA also looking to expand for other Bay Partner jurisdictions. This tool is different from the CWP watershed treatment model because it is consistent with Bay model efficiencies and includes agricultural practices. It is the tool we need to use.
- Q. What is the Level of detail/scale – would it get to the municipality?
- A. Multiple Phase II municipalities will be lumped into one input. Notes field can detail how much can go into each separate MS4. Tool will not track trading. MAST is a planning tool to track how to meet sector load. For example, rural WWTPs could evaluate actions and costs in relation to upgrading plants to BNR vs another plant upgraded to ENR.

Lee Currey then presented the draft Phase I Loading Targets. These targets were provided because of strong requests from the local Teams.

Lynne Hoot, Executive Director of the Maryland Association of Soil Conservation Districts, presented concerns for meeting goals at 2020 vs 2025 and in relation to original 2017 goals based on Phase I strategies. (presentation attached) Agricultural sector has been given 1.35 million lbs nitrogen to reduce in relation to urban growth allowance of 1.3 million lbs. by 2017. The Maryland Farm Bureau sent a letter to Governor requesting extending deadline to 2025 because of cost. Copies of the letters from the Farm Bureau and the MASCD are attached.

Discussion:

Jen Aiosa expressed that the presentation of the cap load in 2020 allowance for growth is being misrepresented. It appears that WWTPs are carrying the reductions to 2017 and gives the impression that with every sector the reductions are more dramatic.

Carlton Haywood stated that the WWTP target is being met early and needs to be considered in the discussion regarding equity.

Lynn also pointed out that we cannot trade nutrients without addressing growth.

Next meeting will be on June 20th 10 to 12. Location - State Chamber Conference Room, Suite 100, 60 West St. in Annapolis right next to the visitor parking on Calvert St.

Topics requested are tracking and monitoring.