



Local Area Planning Goals Task Force Update

Presented to the Water Quality Goal Implementation Team

October 25, 2016



Background

- ▶ December 2015 WQGIT Face to Face Meeting:

- ▶ ACTION: "... convene an ad-hoc Task Force with cross-sector representation that will frame out the options for a WQGIT recommendation regarding the development of local area targets for the Phase III WIPs."

- ▶ 32 Members

- ▶ All Six States and the District of Columbia
- ▶ 2 Federal
- ▶ 8 State
- ▶ 2 Conservation Districts
- ▶ 6 NGOs
- ▶ 2 Local Government Elected Officials
- ▶ 7 Local Government Staff
- ▶ 5 Local Associations



Water Quality GIT Charge

“To make recommendations to the Water Quality Goal Implementation Team (WQGIT) regarding whether the Phase III WIPs should include local area planning targets (LAPTs) and, if so, options for how these targets could be expressed in different jurisdictions.....”



Activities and Progress

- **June 6:** Received presentations on:
 - Monitoring Data & Trends
 - 2015 Progress
 - Phase 6 Model - ability to support local targets
- **July 12:** Received presentations on:
 - Maryland Phase II WIP Engagement
 - Federal facilities approach for setting targets & BMP implementation
- **August 1:** Initial discussion of strawman Decision Document
- **August 30:**
 - Presentation on Phase 6 model support of local decision making
 - Further discussion of strawman document
- **September 8:**
 - Task Force polled to determine agreement on Decision Document
- **October 3:** Further discussion of Decision Document and Recommendations Document be conveyed to Water Quality GIT

Recommendations – Question # 1

Should Local Area Planning Goals Be Established?

- The determination as to whether or not there should be local area planning goals is best made by the seven Chesapeake Bay jurisdictions, in partnership with their local and regional partners, stakeholders and federal and state facilities
- Recommended Factors for Consideration
 - Would local planning goals facilitate the development of local strategies to achieve the Bay TMDL and result in additional implementation actions?
 - Would local planning goals assist local areas in understanding where best to target their efforts and resources?
 - Would local area planning goals accelerate progress toward the implementation of practices to achieve the Chesapeake Bay TMDL?
 - Would local area planning goals provide maximum flexibility to enhance local buy in and engagement in the WIP process?
 - Would local area planning goals allow a jurisdiction to focus limited resources for implementation?
 - Are there feasible methods to monitor the progress towards achieving local area planning goals?
- Majority Task Force Agreement
- Dissenting:
 - Chesapeake Bay Foundation, Chesapeake Bay Commission, EPA
 - Outstanding concerns and dissenting opinions are documented in Appendix A

Recommendations – Question #2

How Should “Local” Be Defined?

- ▶ Locality jurisdictional boundaries or collections of such sub-state political subdivisions
- ▶ Federal facilities
- ▶ State facilities
- ▶ Soil & Water Conservation District (Conservation District) boundaries
- ▶ Regional entity boundaries (i.e. planning district commissions; regional river basin commissions, utility districts)
- ▶ Watershed or sub-watersheds of Chesapeake Bay Tributaries
- ▶ Targeted areas with high nitrogen, phosphorus or sediment yields (loadings)
- ▶ “Segment-sheds” as depicted in the 2010 TMDL
- ▶ Any area, entity or political subdivision based on an identified need for pollutant reductions for a given source sector or sectors
- ▶ Some combination of the above

- ▶ Consensus

Recommendations – Question #3


How Should Local Area Planning Goals Be Expressed?


1. Percentage of Best Management Practice (BMP) Implementation
2. Quantifying implementation goals for particular BMPs
3. Programmatic Goals (i.e. ordinances with provisions for Erosion and Sediment Control, Urban Nutrient Management, post-construction performance standards) that include specific implementation, oversight and enforcement requirements
4. Numeric nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment as expressed as reductions or maximum load goals
 - a) Numeric load goals for one or more pollutants (Delivered load of 300 lbs P)
 - b) Numeric reduction goals for one or more pollutants (reduce loads by 4000 lbs N)
 - c) Yield based goals for one or more pollutants (0.41 lbs P/acre/year from developed lands)
5. Pace of implementation over a certain time frame
6. Percent reduction of existing loads over a certain time frame
7. Percent of flow in certain tributaries/runoff captured – flow-based targets

Consensus



Key Themes

- ▶ Flexibility – Avoid a “cookie-cutter” approach
 - ▶ Goals are a tool for focusing limited resources and targeting programs on defined local areas
 - ▶ Goals should be supported by CBP Partnership decision-support tools
- 



Summary of Questions Requiring Further Task Force Discussion

- ▶ Does the charge outlined by the GIT go beyond how local area planning goals are *defined* to also include *delegation* of responsibility to local entities?
- ▶ Should state jurisdictions have the flexibility to decide whether or not local area planning goals will be established?
- ▶ Do the Partnership's decision support tools adequately support the development of local area planning goals?
- ▶ In what ways can local area planning goals help to focus limited resources?