

Recommendations of the Local Planning Targets Task Force

Introduction:

This document serves as a framework of the key questions upon which the Local Area Targets Task Force has been asked to make recommendations and to facilitate discussion of those questions. The charge given to the Task Force by the Water Quality Goal Implementation Team poses four questions: 1) should the Phase III WIPs include local area planning targets; 2) what are the options for targets, including the scale of targets; and, 3) if there are targets, how should these targets be expressed. This paper presents possible examples for defining “local” and how they might be expressed at different scales. Below is the full charge to the Task Force as well as each of the three questions including example responses to the questions.

Task Force Charge - as Assigned by the Water Quality Goal Implementation Team (WQGIT)

“To make recommendations to the Water Quality Goal Implementation Team (WQGIT) regarding whether the Phase III WIPs should include local area planning targets (LAPTs) and, if so, options for how these targets could be expressed in different jurisdictions. The Local Area Planning Targets Task Force (Task Force) will address findings from the Chesapeake Bay TMDL Stakeholder Assessment, including the goal of raising awareness of local partners’ contribution toward achieving the Bay TMDL; the technical capacity of the Chesapeake Bay Program’s Phase 6 modeling suite; how local implementation addresses local conditions, needs and opportunities, such as local water quality; and the availability of tools to assist in the development and optimization of local implementation strategies. The Task Force will review the efforts of some jurisdictions to develop LAPTs as part of the Phase II WIPs and recent work to establish federal facility targets. Task Force recommendations will be presented as part of the development of the Phase III WIP expectations by EPA.”

What is meant by target?

A target is a local goal that helps the states achieve their WIPs and helps local partners to better understand their expected contributions. Such a target may be expressed in a variety of ways to be determined by the Task Force (see Question #3).

Question #1: How should “local” be defined?

Options for determining what is meant by “local” include:

1. Locality jurisdictional boundaries (city, town, county, borough, township) or collections of such sub-state political subdivisions; federal and state facilities
2. Soil & Water Conservation District (Conservation District) boundaries
3. Regional entity boundaries (i.e. planning district commissions; regional river basin commissions, utility districts)

4. Watershed or sub-watersheds of Chesapeake Bay Tributaries
5. Targeted areas with high nitrogen, phosphorus or sediment yields (loadings)
6. "Segment-sheds" as depicted in the 2010 TMDL
7. Any area, entity or political subdivision based on an identified need for pollutant reductions for a given source sector or sectors
8. A combination of the above

Question #2: Should the Phase III WIPs include local area planning targets (LAPTs)?

As indicated in the Task Force Charge, the first recommendation to address is whether or not LAPTs should be included in the Phase III WIP. Factors to be considered in making this determination include:

- Can the Chesapeake Bay Program Phase 6 modeling suite support local targets?
- Would the establishment of local planning targets facilitate the development of local strategies to achieve the Bay TMDL and result in additional implementation actions?
- Should local targets be established within all states or should they be at the discretion of each state so long as TMDL goals are met? Should different targets be allowed within states, or only for some sectors/geographies and not others?
- Would the targets allow a jurisdiction to focus limited resources for implementation?
- Are the resources available for jurisdictions to do something adequate?
- Are there feasible methods to monitor the progress of the targets?
 - How often does the model have to be run to monitor progress, and how often does progress have to be evaluated?
- Can the Bay Program provide support at a finer scale?
 - *For further discussion: How certain do stakeholders need to be/what level of accuracy would give comfort in using the tools? What is the level of confidence in the finer scale of the available tools? If confidence is not there, how can we assure a greater comfort level with the tools? Recommend getting further opinion on whether the Task Force's discussions on local area targets work with the model.*
- Can the targets provide maximum flexibility for local buy in?
- Are there criteria on who would set the targets, and do those entities have the authority to do so? Should states be required to work with local areas to set targets that are reasonable?

Question #3: How should LAPTs be Expressed

There are many options for how to express local goals in a way that helps states achieve their WIPs, and helps local partners to better understand their expected contributions. Targets may be expressed using any one of these options, or in some combination. All options are supported by the Chesapeake Bay Program partnership's decision support tools (i.e. CAST).

- Percentage of Best Management Practice (BMP) Implementation on land uses defined in the Phase 6 model
- Quantifying implementation goals for particular BMPs
- Programmatic Goals (i.e. ordinances with provisions for Erosion and Sediment Control, Urban Nutrient Management, post-construction performance standards) that include specific implementation, oversight and enforcement requirements
- Numeric nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment as expressed as reductions or maximum load goals
 - Numeric load goals for one or more pollutants (Delivered load of 300 lbs P)
 - Numeric reduction goals for one or more pollutants (reduce loads by 4000 lbs N)
 - Yield based goals for one or more pollutants (0.41 lbs P/acre/year from developed lands)
- Pace of implementation over a certain time frame
- Percent reduction of existing loads over a certain time frame
- Percent of flow in certain tributaries/runoff captured – yield based targets
- *For further discussion – quantity vs. quality goals*