**Chesapeake Bay Program**

**Management Board Meeting/Conference Call**

**Thursday, February 9, 2012**

**Discussion Background for the Evaluation of the 2009-2011 MILESTONES**

2008 Executive Council Meeting: Governor Kaine committed the partnership, at the May 2009 EC meeting, to 1) Adopt a set of 2-year milestones; and 2) Propose a new Bay cleanup deadline

* Guiding Principal: “While milestones for each jurisdiction will likely vary considerably with respect to proposed specific actions, it is critical that the overall combined milestones product be consistent and comprehensive.”

2009 Milestones Guidelines from the EC

* Maintain consistency across the 7 jurisdictions
* Accelerates past rates of implementation (ensure milestones result in accelerated implementation, not just maintaining current pace)
* Milestone outcomes include: pounds reduced , acres implemented, adoption of new regulations, legislation, policies
* Measurable, trackable, reportable and related to the end goal (cap load allocations)
* Jurisdiction-specific milestone outcomes can be rolled up into a single, basin-wide summary
* Account for implementation actions of all partners

April 20-21, 2009 PSC Meeting

* PSC agreed to continue to apply the Phase 4.3 model for development of the initial two-year milestones.
* PSC agreed to the common template for public presentation of two-year milestones.

2010 Executive Council Meeting: The EC directed the Bay jurisdictions and EPA to track and evaluate progress toward implementing the 2009 - 2011 milestones

2011Executive Council Meeting:

* Used an “interim” approach to provide results to EC based on percentage of practices implemented versus the original milestone commitment
  + Model updates were not completed to provide load reduction results at the 2011 EC meeting
* CBP partners committed to report to EC a final assessment of load reductions achieved during the entire three-year period to be available at next year's (2012) EC meeting.

May 2011 Memo on Milestones

* EPA expects the final evaluation of 2009‐2011 milestones to be based on reductions in nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment loads
* EPA expects to compare loads resulting from the 2011 progress run to the 2008 baseline progress run to assess reductions resulting from the 2009‐2011 milestones
* EPA will work with Bay jurisdictions to determine how to evaluate final milestone progress

Issues with Model Phase 4.3

* Phase in place when milestones were developed but not all the jurisdictions used 4.3 for milestone development
* Does not allow credit for the new BMPs that are in phase 5.3.2
* Not compatible with NEIEN
* Jurisdictions would need to submit 2 input decks and CBPO would complete two 2011 progress runs for 1) 4.3 and 2) 5.3.2, creating extra effort for Partnership and confusion for public

Issues with Model Phase 5.3.2

* Less effort on all fronts to assess progress
  + States only submit and CBPO only processes 1 input deck for 2011 progress run
  + NEIEN data compatible with 5.3.2
* Using this model phase maintains consistency with 2012-2013 and future milestones and Phase II Planning Targets
* More BMPs available for credit in the model
* Milestone workgroup supported using 5.3.2 during conference call from April 14, 2011

**Options to evaluate the 2009-2011 Milestones**

Option 1 using 5.3.2 Percent Reduction Comparison

* Calculate % reduction committed to between 2008 and the 2011 milestone in the original milestone commitments announced by EC in 2009
* Calculate % reduction achieved between 2008 and 2011 under 5.3.2
* Compare the % reduction from 2008 to 2011 in 5.3.2 vs. the original commitment and report to

EC whether jurisdictions achieved the original % reduction commitments

* Allow jurisdictions to provide narrative for supplemental actions

Option 2 using 5.3.2 Straight Line Projection Target

* Compare the 2011 progress run loads in 5.3.2 to the straight line projection data of reductions from 2009 to 2017 that were distributed to the Milestone Workgroup on 10/11/11
* Report to EC whether the jurisdiction is meeting the calculated target
* Allow jurisdictions to provide narrative for supplemental actions

Option 3 Individual qualitative self report

* Report out on individual practices from their 2009 milestone factsheet and provide a percent completion based on practices implemented
* Status evaluation is subjective, i.e. on track, ahead/behind schedule
* Allow jurisdictions to provide narrative for supplemental actions

**Options for Process to Evaluate Bay Jurisdictions Progress**

Option 1: Percent reduction comparison

* Direct comparison between milestone commitments and results
* Comparing percentages, based on modeled loads

Option 2: Straight Line Projection Target

* Jurisdictions did not know TMDL allocations when creating 2009-2011 milestones
* Compare model results to a straight calculation

Option 3: Individual qualitative self report

* Does not meet charge of 2009 or 2011
* No straight-forward process to account for a shift in strategies