

Chesapeake Bay TMDL's Phase III WIP Stakeholder Assessment & Action Plan

Water Quality Goal Implementation Team Meeting
December 15, 2015

Presented by Frank Dukes, Ph.D. Institute for
Environmental Negotiation University of Virginia and
Lucinda Power, EPA Chesapeake Bay Program Office



Purpose of Today's Discussion

- Sign-off on Final Report
 - Highlight of changes
 - Summary of local concerns
- Discussion of Draft Action Plan
 - Kicks off 30-day review & comment period
- Timeline for Phase III





Stakeholder Breakdown

Contacted 204 stakeholders throughout Bay watershed

Spoke to 121 individuals

District of Columbia – 8

Agriculture – 9

Delaware – 10

Stormwater – 6 (undercounted)

Maryland – 13

Wastewater – 15 (undercounted)

New York – 3

State Government – 28 + 8 D.C.

Pennsylvania – 32

Local Government – 19 + 8 D.C.

Virginia – 27

NGO – 11

West Virginia – 8

EPA – 19

Add'l Federal Landowners – 2



Three Stories

- Story One
 - *Implementing the Chesapeake Bay TMDL and meeting applicable water quality standards in the Bay and its tidal rivers is our highest priority*
- Story Two
 - *The Bay TMDL is one priority among many, largely because of regulatory or institutional mandates*
- Story Three
 - *The Bay TMDL is an unfair burden that impinges on other priorities*



Summary of Local Concerns

- Localities vary widely in relationship to Bay
- Negative viewpoint of Phase II because of model, lack of authentic collaboration, and accelerated schedule
- Not just about water quality; other competing priorities at stake
- Unsure of what is needed to be done and by whom
- Frequent changes in political administration
- Equity – why ask sectors already doing their share to do more? Capacity will vary across sectors
- Substantial investments already made – what if required to do more?



What Needs to Happen Moving Forward

- Involve localities early and often
- Bring localities together to share information
- Consistent messaging – who, what, where, how and why
- Adopt realistic schedules & secure funding
- Increase understanding about the value of Bay restoration





Highlight of Changes to Report

- No substantive changes
- Comments supportive of:
 - Increased local engagement
 - Improving use of tools by better training
 - Best use of resources – focus on practices that work and have dedicated staff, and those with the most cost benefits
 - Recognize political and financial realities, and competing priorities
 - Increased funding and resources
 - Allocating reductions at local scale – HUC 10 or 12
 - Inequity of regulated community making up deficits from other sectors





Draft Action Plan

- **Purpose:** Translate assessment findings into actions to inform development of Phase III WIP expectations.
- **Goal of Action Plan:** Strengthen local engagement in Phase III WIP development.
- **Specific actions under review:**
 - Identify and share local engagement successes
 - Develop and implement communication plans
 - Identify target audiences for communications and engagement
 - Explore development of local area targets



Next Steps for Action Plan

- 30-day CBP partnership review period
 - December 10 – January 21
- Seeking WQGIT approval of action plan on January 25, 2016
- Submit to MB and PSC for their approval in Feb-March 2016



Decisions & Next Steps

- Does the WQGIT **accept** the final Stakeholder Assessment Report on behalf of the CBP partnership?
- Does the WQGIT **agree** to the schedule for finalizing the Action Plan?



Phase III WIP Expectations Schedule

- **October 2016:** EPA presents preliminary expectations and seeks initial input from CBP partnership
- **Spring 2017:** EPA presents revised draft expectations and seeks final input from CPB partnership
- **June 2017:** EPA presents final Phase III WIP expectations, including expectations for jurisdiction and Federal Agency milestones development for 2018-2025
- **June 2018:** Draft Phase III WIPs due to EPA
- **December 2018:** Final Phase III WIPs due to EPA



Questions & Discussion

