



Local Planning Goals Task Force Recommendations

1

Principals' Staff Committee Meeting

December 13, 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.....”

Charge poses 3 questions:

- 1. Should Local Area Planning Goals Be Established?**
- 2. How Should “Local” or scale be Defined?**
- 3. How Should Local Area Planning Goals Be Expressed?**

Recommendations – Question #1

4

Should Local Area Planning Goals Be Established?

- ▶ Initial recommendation: Determination of whether or not to establish local goals is best made by the 7 Bay jurisdictions
- ▶ Task Force recognizes the intent of Water Quality GIT that local planning goals *should* be established by each of the seven Chesapeake Bay jurisdictions at a scale below the state-major river basin
- ▶ The Task Force recommends that the jurisdictions have flexibility as to the scale of the local goals and how they should be expressed working with their local and regional partners, stakeholders and federal and state facilities, within the parameters of the Water Quality GIT

Factors to Consider When Establishing Local Planning Goals

- ▶ How would the state work with their local partners to established local planning goals that are realistic and achievable?
- ▶ What programs are already in place and what programs would be developed that could improve facilitation of local partner implementation in meeting the Bay TMDL and WIP commitments?
- ▶ What tools are already available to states to focus limited resources to achieve the greatest reductions?
- ▶ How will progress be tracked, reported and evaluated?

Recommendations – Question #2

6

How Should “Local” or Scale 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 (e.g. MS4), entity or political subdivision based on an identified need for pollutant reductions for a given source sector or sectors
- ▶ Some combination of the above

Recommendations – Question #3

7

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 (i.e. delivered load of 300 lbs P)
 - b) Numeric reduction goals for one or more pollutants (i.e. reduce loads by 4000 lbs N)
 - c) Yield based goals for one or more pollutants (i.e 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

Next Steps

- Finalize document based on 12/6/16 Task Force conference call
- Present recommendations to Principal Staff Committee on 12/13/16
- Present Final Recommendations to Water Quality GIT on 12/19/16

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

Decision Requested

- ▶ Agreement by the Principals' Staff Committee that the Task Force's final recommendations will be incorporated into EPA's January 2017 Phase III WIP Expectations document.