

Chesapeake Bay Program's Citizens Advisory Committee November 20, 2015 Meeting

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



Chesapeake Bay Stakeholder Assessment Process Design

Call EPA staff involved in the project

• To discuss in more detail what EPA perceives are the incentives, frustrations, obstacles or barriers to achieving the goal of the project, what processes are going well, the technical or substantive issues involved in the project from EPA's

perspective, other

parties potentially

public participation

consultation efforts already underway.

involved in the

project and the

efforts or

Develop an approach for the assessment

• This includes reading suggested background material, consulting with EPA, submitting a process design, and revising the approach based upon feedback from EPA and/or the Water Quality Goal Implementation Team.

Develop the protocol for discussions

- Design protocol for the conversation with participants.
- Secure recommendations from Chesapeake Bay Program Water Quality Goal Implementation Team for stakeholders to contact.
- Develop database to track conversations.
- Test discussion protocol during initial stakeholder conversations with key parties.

Approach for Completing the Assessment

Prepared by Frank Dukes, Ph.D.
Institute for Environmental Negotiation
University of Virginia

Chesapeake Bay Stakeholder Assessment **Process Design**

Conversations with the stakeholders

Distribute draft report

Assessment)

process of the

presented.

• Prepare a draft written

assessment, the parties

discussed and the range

with the opportunity to

of input and opinions

Provide stakeholders

review and confirm

accurately captured

through review of a

the conversations

views expressed during

preliminary draft of the

stakeholder assessment.

that the draft

assessment has

who were contacted, the issues that were

report (Stakeholder

summarizing the

- - What aspects of the Phase I and II WIP process facilitated implementation
 - What topics does the Phase III WIP process need to address more directly
 - How Phase III WIPs and the oversight of implementation could better engage local partners and accelerate the implementation of pollution reduction practices
 - appropriate and/or as suggested by stakeholders.

- Edit and prepare final report
 - Upon receipt of comments, prepare and submit a final written report and distribute it as needed to relevant parties.
 - Discuss with the WQGIT.

• Other topics as

Prepared by Frank Dukes, Ph.D.

11/20/15

Approach for

Completing

the

Assessment

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



Story One

Implementing the Chesapeake Bay TMDL and meeting applicable water quality standards in the Bay and its tidal rivers is our highest priority

- Complete the Chesapeake Bay TMDL on schedule
- There are substantial benefits to the Bay and local waters
- EPA needs to provide backstop measures to stay on schedule
- Advocates for the Bay have worked hard to secure funding
- Monitoring shows less improvement than modeling



University of Virginia

Story Two

The Bay TMDL is one priority among many, largely because of regulatory or institutional mandates

- Recognize political and financial realities at state and local levels
- The Bay TMDL schedule can't be met
- Too much uncertainty and confusion about what is and what will be required
- Demands keep growing while support has not kept up



Story Three

The Bay TMDL is an unfair burden that impinges on other priorities

- The Bay is not important for my jurisdiction or sector
- We need more support and a realistic schedule
- Participation should be voluntary no unfunded mandates
- No backstops and contingencies



Lots of Good Work to Date!

- Early outreach and continued communication
- Stakeholders can work out differences when involved early
- Money & technical support are vital
- Show local benefits
- Listen adapting Model & mandates



University of Virginia

Many Shared Concerns and Ideas

- 1) Equity
- 2) Communication
- 3) Collaborative Leadership
- 4) Accountability for Results
- 5) Funding and other resources
- 6) Cost-effectiveness
- 7) Adaptability
- 8) Schedule
- 9) Bay Model



Participant Questions

- Will loads change? will the TMDL have to be reopened?
- How to make reductions real to the people who have to make them?
- Will there be a new model for funding for Phase III?
- What does the 60% by 2017 represent? Jurisdictions have different views of what this means ...



Completing the Assessment

- Draft Assessment is currently under partnership review for a 45- day period (comments are due November 19)
- Management Board and PSC have endorsed the formation of a small team overseen by the WQGIT to convert findings and observations into a follow through action plan
- Action plan will be brought to the Management Board and the Principals' Staff Committee at their January 2016 meetings for decisions on how partnership will use the assessment findings in the overall development of the Phase III WIP expectations and in the local engagement development process



Elements of the Draft Action Plan

- Focused on actions to strengthen and facilitate local engagement in Phase III WIP development and implementation
 - Identify successes and working relationships from Phase I and Phase II to communicate and adopt in Phase III
 - Establish stakeholder groups that would be representative of each source sector to determine sector-specific needs and resource capacity
 - Develop local area targets to clearly set goal for local jurisdictions
 - Develop communication plans and identify target audiences for engagement
 - Initiate pilot programs to identify funding and resource needs and capacity



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

