

WQGIT F2F Meeting September 25-26, 2017

Decisions & Recommendations to the PSC



Scenario Year for Phase III WIP Planning Targets

WQGIT Recommendation to the PSC

- Use **2010** as the scenario year for establishing the draft Phase III WIP planning targets.
- Further analysis is needed to understand why E3 and No Action increased in certain areas in future years.

2025 Growth Projections

WQGIT Decision

- Use the CBLCM and MD Land Use Model to establish growth projections, with the opportunity to provide data or alternative modeling approaches in future years, which will be vetted through the Partnership approval process (starting with the Land Use Workgroup).

WQGIT Decision

- Drop the historical trends scenario and instead focus on the current policy scenario, as zoning decisions have shaped historical trends and local jurisdictions are more likely to accept a scenario that includes their zoning information.

2025 Growth Projections

WQGIT Decision

- Implement minor refinements to the CBLCM that are recommended by the LUWG by October 31, 2017, coordinating with the USWG, WWTWG and AgWG.
 - State and local partners will (1) review the tabular and spatial data and (2) further refine the “Current Zoning” scenario by October 31, 2017 so the LUWG can discuss at their first November meeting and deliver it to the CBPO modeling team by November 15, 2017.
 - Historical trends data will be in CAST by October 2, 2017.
 - Current zoning data will be in CAST by January 2018.
 - State and local jurisdictions can begin running Phase III WIP scenarios on historical trend projections by October 2, 2017.

2025 Growth Projections

WQGIT Decision

- The LUWG will continue working on alternative future scenarios identified during the Local Government Forum – current zoning plus and conservation plus scenarios.
- Priority is to get the conservation plus scenario done by January 15, 2018. It will then go into the modeling system six weeks after that date (so it will be available in CAST by March 2018).

2025 Growth Projections

WQGIT Recommendation to the PSC

- Use 2025 growth projections to account for growth in the Phase III WIPs.
 - States can use 2017 (current) as a baseline and run the Phase III WIPs on 2025 growth projections to understand what's changing in each source sector as a result of growth.
 - This current baseline will help inform the description in the Phase III WIPs of the policies, BMPs and/or programs in place to address that growth.

WQGIT Recommendation to the PSC

- Update the growth projections every 2 years with the best available data to inform the development of the two-year milestones.
 - Need to be clear about what new data has been incorporated into the projections on this two-year basis, and what has changed as a result of incorporating this new data.

Climate Change

Decision Point #1: Approve policy approach to guide jurisdictions' development and implementation of their Phase III WIPs.

WQGIT Recommendation to PSC:

- Language changes on the policy options have been requested, including the removal of qualitative policy option Element A related to Phase III WIP development. The Climate Resiliency Workgroup will revise the language prior to the PSC October 30/31 meeting.

Climate Change

Decision Point #2: Establish “minimum” standard for implementation in jurisdictions’ Phase III WIPs.

WQGIT Recommendation to the PSC:

- Did not reach consensus on the quantitative policy options - incorporating 2025 climate change projections into the planning targets (assimilative capacity) and Phase III WIP development process.
- The CBPO Modeling Team will run the Phase III WIPs on 2025 climate change projections to give each jurisdiction an understanding of how their level of effort may change.
 - This information will be available by the time of the December 13, 2017 PSC meeting.

Climate Change

Decision Point #2: Establish “minimum” standard for implementation in jurisdictions’ Phase III WIPs.

WQGIT Recommendation to the PSC:

- Did not reach consensus on adopting qualitative policy options Element B and Element C, absent adopting a quantitative approach.
 - One non-jurisdictional partner was not in agreement with adopting a qualitative approach unless a quantitative approach was also adopted.
- Pros and cons of each quantitative and qualitative policy option will be developed and discussed during one of the WQGIT’s October conference calls, prior to the October 30/31 PSC meeting.

Climate Change

Decision Point #3: Establish the level of flexibility among jurisdictions for implementation of climate change policies that exceed minimum standards.

WQGIT Recommendation to the PSC:

- Provide the jurisdictions with the flexibility to address climate change quantitatively in the Phase III WIPs and 2-year milestones, if the Partnership adopts the qualitative policy options.

Climate Change

WQGIT Recommendation to the PSC:

- If the level of effort to achieve the quantitative reductions are relatively low, consider adopting the quantitative approach in addition to any qualitative options.
- Should the quantitative options be adopted, consider the possibility of post-2025 implementation to address any changes in levels of effort.

Conowingo Dam

WQGIT Recommendation to the PSC:

- There is a need to address Conowingo now, as we know it's a changed condition and Partnership decisions should inform the CWA 401 certification discussions between MD and Exelon.

Conowingo Dam

WQGIT Recommendation to the PSC:

- Remove the options of “All Basins” and “Susquehanna + MD + VA” assuming responsibility for addressing Conowingo Dam.
 - Not cost-effective, increases load due to incorporating more non-effective basins, negatively impacts WV, DE, and DC.
- Present the “Susquehanna + most effective basins” option for PSC consideration.
- However, **show all scenario options for comparative purposes.**

Conowingo Dam

WQGIT Recommendation to the PSC:

- Develop a Conowingo infill phosphorus load separate from the Phase III WIP planning targets, the removal of which would become a local planning goal.
- MD, PA, NY, and Exelon would need to determine how to account for reductions equivalent to the Conowingo infill phosphorus load, coming up with a multi-strategy approach.
 - Strategy can go beyond looking at just load reductions – for example, variances, dredging, USACE Comprehensive Plan, contribution(s) from Exelon.
 - Consider a letter from the PSC to Exelon on expectations for addressing increased Conowingo infill loads in the CWA 401 certification.
- Consider future implementation beyond 2025 given the impacts to levels of effort.

Draft Phase III WIP Planning Targets

WQGIT Recommendation to the PSC

- Run the Phase III WIP planning targets on Phase 6 relative effectiveness with current conditions, which will assign loads to each state-basin.
- If the Partnership decides to treat Conowingo as a separate load, this may double count the effects of Conowingo in the Susquehanna basins.
- Therefore, we would need to subtract out the Conowingo loads by using the 1990s delivery factors for the Conowingo.
- Further investigation is needed to explain differences in Phase 6, as compared to Phase 5.
 - Why WIP attainment of planning targets decreased significantly for WV, NY, MD and DC.
 - Why WIP attainment of planning targets increased significantly for DE.

Next Steps for Final Phase 6 Calibration

During the months of October and November...

- Nail down the WQSTM for final calibration so we can understand the new assimilative capacity of the Chesapeake Bay.
- Confirm if Phase 6 geographic isolation runs need to be re-run.
- Need to see what changes there are to the assimilative capacity due to the effects of (1) Conowingo and (2) climate change.
- Flesh out the storyline to understand the scenario results presented to the WQGIT during their F2F meeting.
- Need to run .17 m SLR through the final Phase 6 modeling tools.
- Conduct sensitivity scenarios for tidal wetland loss

Upcoming 2017 PSC Decisions

- **Decisions for October 30/31, 2017 PSC Meeting**
 - Revised schedule for finalizing the Phase 6 modeling tools and release of the draft Phase III WIP planning targets.
 - Whether to use 2025 growth projections in the Phase III WIPs.
 - Update on WQGIT discussions of how to address Conowingo and climate change in the Phase III WIPs.
- **Decisions for December 13, 2017 PSC Meeting**
 - Approval of the final calibrated Phase 6 suite of modeling tools.
 - How to address additional loads from Conowingo Dam, including (1) who is responsible and how additional loads should be allocated and (2) when to address additional loads.
 - How and when to incorporate climate change considerations in the Phase III WIPs.
 - Approval and release of the draft Phase III WIP planning targets for Partnership review.

Proposed Revised Schedule for Finalizing Phase 6 Modeling Tools & Draft Phase III WIP Planning Targets

- **First week of December 2017**
 - Joint Modeling Workgroup and WQGIT meeting to make recommendations on how to address Conowingo and climate change in the Phase III WIPs; approve Phase 6 suite of modeling tools, review draft Phase III WIP planning targets, and review revised geographic isolation scenarios.
- **December 13, 2017**
 - PSC meeting to make final decisions on how to address Conowingo Dam and climate change in the Phase III WIPs; approval of the Phase 6 suite of modeling tools; and release of the draft Phase III WIP planning targets for 4-month Partnership review.
- **December 14, 2017 – April 13, 2018**
 - Partnership review of the draft Phase III WIP planning targets.
- **April 30, 2018**
 - Release of the final Phase III WIP planning targets.