



DISCUSSION FOR THE EVALUATION OF 2009-2011 MILESTONES

**Suzanne Trevena
WQGIT conference call
November 14, 2011**

1

OBJECTIVE

- Background
- Options
- Discussion
- Next Steps

MILESTONES GUIDELINES FROM 2009 EC

- Maintain consistency across the 7 jurisdictions
- Accelerates past rates of implementation
- 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

2010 EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETING

- Chesapeake Bay Executive Council has directed the Bay jurisdictions and EPA to track and evaluate progress toward implementing the 2009-2011 milestones

2011 EXECUTIVE 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.

MILESTONE MEMO MAY 2011

- 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

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

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:

- 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

OPTIONS TO EVALUATE THE 2009-2011 MILESTONES

Option 2 using 5.3.2:

- 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 on 10/11/11
- Report to EC whether the jurisdiction is meeting the calculated target
- Allow jurisdictions to provide narrative for supplemental actions

OPTIONS TO EVALUATE THE 2009-2011 MILESTONES BASED ON PRACTICES IMPLEMENTED

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

WHAT IS THE BEST PROCESS TO EVALUATE BAY JURISDICTIONS' PROGRESS?

- Option 1: % reduction comparison
 - Direct comparison between milestone commitments and results
 - Comparing percentages, not modeled loads
- Option 2: straight line projection
 - Jurisdictions did not know TMDL allocations when creating 2009-2011 milestones
 - Compare results to a straight calculation, not a model run
- 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
 - Subjective status

NEXT STEPS

- Discuss the options presented to evaluate 2009-2011 and any additional suggestions from the workgroup
- Present WQGIT recommendations to Management Board