





2017 WIP, 2025 WIP and Water Quality Standards Attainment & Monitoring Outcomes Management Strategy 2015–2025, v.1.2



I. Introduction

For the past 30 years, the Chesapeake Bay Program (CBP) partnership¹ has been committed to achieving and maintaining the water quality conditions necessary to support living resources throughout the Chesapeake Bay watershed. Building off these commitments and using the best scientific information available, the CBP partnership agreed to the nutrient and sediment allocations in the 2010 Chesapeake Bay Total Maximum Daily Load (Bay TMDL)², a historic and comprehensive pollution reduction effort in the Chesapeake Bay watershed. The Bay TMDL identifies the necessary pollution reductions of nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment across the seven Bay watershed jurisdictions of Delaware, Maryland, New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia and the District of Columbia to meet applicable water quality standards in the Bay and its tidal waters. Reducing pollution is critical to restoring the Chesapeake Bay

¹ www.chesapeakebay.net

² EPA's Chesapeake Bay TMDL: www.epa.gov/chesapeakebaytmdl/

watershed because clean water is the foundation for healthy fisheries, habitats, and communities across the region. All partners and source sectors³ must contribute substantial efforts to achieve the Bay TMDL allocations.

The Watershed Implementation Plans (WIPs), developed by the seven Bay watershed jurisdictions, provide a roadmap for how the jurisdictions, in partnership with federal and local governments, will achieve the Bay TMDL's nutrient and sediment allocations. As such, the WIPs collectively serve as the foundation of the management strategy for the water quality related outcomes. The jurisdictions are expected to develop WIPs over three Phases. Phase I and Phase II WIPs, developed and submitted to EPA in 2010 and 2012, respectively, describe actions and controls to be implemented by 2017 and 2025 to achieve applicable water quality standards. The Phase II WIPs build on the initial Phase I WIPs by providing more specific local actions. The Phase I and Phase II WIPs can be accessed here: www.epa.gov/chesapeakebaytmdl. As part of the accountability framework established in the Bay TMDL document, jurisdictions also establish short-term goals in the form of two-year milestones which are based on the WIPs and have been reported to EPA since 2011.

In 2018, the seven Bay watershed jurisdictions will develop Phase III WIPs that provide more information on what actions the jurisdictions intend to implement between 2018 and 2025. Based on a midpoint assessment of progress and scientific analyses that is currently underway through 2017, the Phase III WIPs will be developed so that by 2025 all practices are in place that are necessary to meet applicable water quality standards in the Bay and its tidal tributaries.

In conjunction with the implementation of the WIPs, the CBP partnership is currently engaged in an evaluation of water quality changes to explain progress toward meeting water quality standards and the Bay TMDL. This evaluation includes assessing changes in nutrients and sediment in the Bay watershed and analyzing water quality trends in the estuary and tidal tributaries. In addition, the CBP partnership will conduct selected assessments of factors affecting progress towards restoring water quality, habitat, fish and wildlife, and conserving lands, including the effects of management activities. Further incorporation and use of monitoring information to assess progress is critical to better understand how on the ground actions have an impact toward meeting the 2017 and 2025 WIP outcomes, particularly since monitoring assessments will ultimately determine when the jurisdictions' water quality standards are achieved.

II. Goal, Outcome and Baseline

This management strategy identifies approaches for achieving the following goal and outcomes:



Water Quality Goal

Reduce pollutants to achieve water quality necessary to support the aquatic living resources of the Bay and its tributaries and protect human health.

³ Section 4 of the Bay TMDL: wastewater, agriculture, urban storm water, septic systems, forests and air

2017 WIP Outcome

By 2017, have practices and controls in place that are expected to achieve 60 percent of the nutrient and sediment pollution load reductions necessary to achieve applicable water quality standards compared to 2009 levels.

2025 WIP Outcome

By 2025, have all practices and controls installed to achieve the Bay's dissolved oxygen, water clarity/submerged aquatic vegetation and chlorophyll a standards as articulated in the Chesapeake Bay TMDL document.

Water Quality Standards Attainment & Monitoring Outcome

Continually improve the capacity to monitor and assess the effects of management actions being undertaken to implement the Bay TMDL and improve water quality. Use the monitoring results to report annually to the public on progress made in attaining established Bay water quality standards and trends in reducing nutrients and sediment in the watershed.

Baseline and Current Condition

Background

In 2009, the Chesapeake Bay Executive Council established the CBP goal that all practices for a clean Chesapeake Bay be in place by 2025. The Bay TMDL document describes this goal, as well as the interim goal that practices be in place by 2017 to achieve 60 percent of the necessary reductions compared to 2009. The baseline for the 2017 goal are the 2009 estimates of nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment loads (in pounds per year) in the Chesapeake Bay watershed. These estimates were obtained from the CBP partnership's modeling tools that are calibrated to monitoring data and use implementation data collected from the seven Bay watershed jurisdictions. The year 2009 was established as the baseline year because it the last year for which pollution reduction progress was assessed prior to EPA establishing the Bay TMDL in 2010.

~~In 2012, the CBP partnership endorsed an integrated approach to assessing progress toward meeting the Bay TMDL nutrient and sediment reduction goals and attaining applicable water quality standards through using both modeling tools and monitoring data. CBP partners reaffirmed their continued support for monitoring networks, annual reporting of standards attainment, and nutrient and sediment trends in the watershed. For the past two years, CBP's Science, Technical Assessment and Reporting Team (STAR) has been focused on Building and Sustaining Integrated Networks (BASIN). BASIN is an effort to develop new approaches to expand and sustain the CBP monitoring activities to meet the needs of the CBP partnership.~~

The Chesapeake Bay's tidal waters are divided into 92 segments, and each segment has up to five designated aquatic life uses which equates to a total of 291 designated uses. The measure of success for this integrated approach is to meet all applicable nutrient- and sediment-related water quality standards in the tidal Chesapeake Bay necessary to protect the designated uses for those 92 segments.

Formatted: Strikethrough

Commented [PT1]: I believe we have the baseline mentioned, and then in the next section we give the 2016 update. That should cover it.

Commented [PT2]:

Commented [PT3R2]:

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Progress to Date

The WIPs identify how the seven Bay watershed jurisdictions are putting measures in place by 2025 that are needed to restore the Bay, and by 2017 to achieve at least 60 percent of the necessary nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment reductions compared to 2009 levels. While the Chesapeake Bay Partnership exceeded the 60% goals for reducing phosphorus and sediment, it fell short of the 2017 target for reducing nitrogen by 15 million pounds. The implementation of BMPs specifically in the agricultural and urban sectors will need to accelerate to close this gap.

As of ~~2013~~2017³, based on the CBP partnership modeling tool estimates, practices are in place to achieve ~~27-40~~ percent of the nitrogen reductions, ~~87-93~~ percent of the phosphorus reductions and ~~67-77~~ percent of the sediment reductions (compared to 2009 levels) that are necessary to attain applicable water quality standards in the Bay^{4,5}.

Attaining water quality standards is essential to other CBP goal areas including habitat and fisheries. Attaining the standards also provides substantial benefits for protection of human health, aesthetic and recreational uses. The “water quality standards attainment” outcome will require the monitoring of water quality conditions to assess progress towards achieving applicable water quality standards in Bay and tidal water restoration to support aquatic living resources.

~~Through 2012, the CBP partnership found that 31 percent of the Bay and its tidal waters were attaining applicable water quality standards (i.e., 90 of 291 designated uses have been met). Seventy percent of the monitoring sites through 2012 showed long-term improvements in nitrogen and phosphorus. From 2003-2012, nitrogen conditions improved at about one-half of monitoring sites, while phosphorus concentrations show little or no change at more than one-half of such sites. Improvement for sediment concentrations is less than that for nutrients, with 28 percent of monitoring sites showing long-term improvement (since 1985) and 10 percent of sites from 2003-2012⁶.~~

During the 2014-2016 status assessment, the CBP partnership estimates that 40 percent of the Bay and its tidal waters were attaining applicable water quality standards – the highest value since data collection began in 1985. The long-term trend in water quality standards attainment is positive showing improvement in environmental health. For long-term water quality trends in nontidal rivers across the watershed, fifty percent of the nontidal network monitoring sites through 2016 showed improvements in nitrogen loads, 31 percent are degrading, and the remainder are showing little or no change. About one third of monitoring sites showed improvements in phosphorus loads, 25 percent are degrading, and the remainder are showing little or no change. Improvement for sediment loads was observed at 20 percent of monitoring sites, while 37 percent are degrading, and the remainder are showing little or no change⁷.

Commented [PL4]: needs to be updated to reflect 2017 progress (60% of 2017 goals achievement) and new monitoring trends call

⁴ http://www.chesapeakebay.net/documents/FINAL_WIP_Outcome_6-13-14_PDF.pdf

⁵ <http://www.chesapeakeprogress.com/clean-water/watershed-implementation-plans>

⁶ http://www.chesapeakebay.net/documents/FINAL_WQ_Stand_Attain_6-13-14_PDF.pdf

⁷ https://cbrim.er.usgs.gov/data/NTN%20Load%20and%20Trend%20Summary%202016_Combined.pdf

III. Participating Partners

The following partners have participated in the development of this strategy. ~~A workplan to accompany this management strategy will be within one year after this document is finalized. It will identify specific partner commitments for implementing the strategy.~~

- District of Columbia
 - Delaware
 - Maryland
 - New York
 - Pennsylvania
 - Virginia
 - West Virginia
 - U.S Environmental Protection Agency
 - Chesapeake Bay Commission
 - U.S. Geological Survey

Formatted: Body Text before bullet

Local Engagement

The Bay TMDL document, which describes an accountability framework including the 2017 and 2025 WIP outcomes, was developed through a highly transparent and engaging process. The outreach effort included hundreds of meetings with interested groups; two rounds of public meetings, stakeholder sessions and media interviews in all Bay watershed jurisdictions in fall of 2009 and 2010; a dedicated EPA website; a series of monthly interactive webinars; notices published in the Federal Register; EPA response to all TMDL comments; and a close working relationship with CBP committees representing citizens, local governments, and the scientific community. It was at the discretion of the Bay watershed jurisdictions to hold their own public meetings and public comment period for their respective WIPs, as these were state-developed documents⁸.

Commented [PL5]: Update to include Phase III local engagement strategies and local planning goals

A substantial portion of the nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment controls necessary to meet the Bay TMDL allocations is expected to be implemented at the local level by CBP partners including conservation districts, local governments, planning commissions, utilities and watershed associations. Outreach to a variety of local entities may help the CBP partners assess and determine the ideal scale at which implementation will be reflected in the CBP modeling tools and where appropriate, quantify local target loads within the WIPs. The CBP partnership recognizes that individual jurisdictions may pursue somewhat different approaches to this local outreach.

The Phase III WIP local engagement strategies should provide a strong foundation for success, built on government leadership, strategic aligned federal-state-local priorities, strong networks, sufficient financial and programmatic capacity, and clear communication of roles and responsibilities. EPA expects draft and final Phase III WIPs to include a detailed strategy of how each jurisdiction will engage its respective local partners in implementation of Phase III WIPs⁹. After release of the final state planning

⁸ [DE WIP](#); [DC WIP](#); [MD WIP](#); [NY WIP](#); [PA WIP](#); [VA WIP](#); [WV WIP](#)

⁹ [https://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/24426/epa-phase-iii-wip-expectations-6-19-18_\(1\).pdf](https://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/24426/epa-phase-iii-wip-expectations-6-19-18_(1).pdf)

targets, the jurisdictions will develop local area planning goals based on those planning targets available here: <https://cast.chesapeakebay.net/Documentation/planninggoals>.

IV. Factors Influencing Success

The following are natural and human factors that influence the Partnership's ability to attain this outcome:

Implementation of Practices

1. Continuing to sustain the capacity of governments and the private sector to implement practices

The state and local jurisdictions have described their capacity (funding, authorities, and sustainability) to implement nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment reduction practices several times over the past two decades. These include the tributary strategies developed during the 1990s and again in the mid-2000s, and more recently, in the Phase I and Phase II WIPs and two-year milestones, which also include strategies to build capacity in order to achieve pollutant reductions. Federal agencies and land holders have described their capacity (funding, authorities, and sustainability) to implement nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment reduction practices through the programs they administer or on the lands that they control as part of Executive Order 13508¹⁰. These entities must continue to work towards sustaining adequate capacity necessary to complete the efforts.

2. Delivering the necessary financial capacity to implement practices and programs

Both understanding and addressing the financial capacity needs to implement the Phase I WIPs, the Phase II WIPs and two-year milestones is an integral component to achieving the water quality goals in the Bay TDML. The CBP partnership is focused on addressing these financial needs through: quantification of existing and potential funding gaps, and the identification of new revenue sources and financing to address these gaps; consideration of how costs might be reduced by more cost-effectively reallocating nutrient and sediment reductions among source sectors; evaluation of BMP implementation and maintenance costs; and communication of funding needs to elected officials.

¹⁰ Executive Order 13508: http://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/Executive-Order-Chesapeake-Bay-Protection-and-Restoration

Improved Technical Information

1. Improving the identification of sources and their contributions to nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment pollutant loads

The sources and their respective contribution of loads listed in the Bay TMDL is currently represented through CBP partnership models¹¹, USGS SPARROW models¹², and supporting tidal and nontidal monitoring networks and research. As described in the Bay TMDL document (Chapter 4), the sources that are modeled by the CBP partnership are based on U.S. Census Bureau and USDA Census data, federal and state permitting data, satellite imagery and additional data submitted by the seven Bay watershed jurisdictions. As part of the Bay TMDL's midpoint assessment, the CBP partnership is currently incorporating additional/more recent local land use data, refining information on the transport of loads through the Bay watershed, and better predicting future impacts of population growth and climate change in the Bay watershed for incorporation into the modeling tools to improve implementation planning in Phase III.

2. Develop a business strategy for sustaining and growing monitoring programming that supports information needs

Sustaining and growing the capacity of the partnerships monitoring program is necessary to maintain information needs. Negative pressures on program maintenance derive from annual cost inflation reducing the power of a dollar to accomplish the same work, replacing aging infrastructure and lost partnerships. Gap-filling opportunities have been discussed by STAR and its workgroups in meetings and STAC Workshops. Commitments to incorporating new partners, new technologies and new assessment protocols that leverage existing programming while adapting and enhancing approaches that improve information gathering resolution and efficiency will be strategically necessary to sustain the monitoring capacity into the future.

3. Support the use of new data streams having classified their integrity

The monitoring program provides marginal support for assessing water quality standards attainment in the bay and adequate, but not recommended, levels of monitoring in evaluating pollution inputs from the watershed to the bay. Partnership support and use of new data streams such as those being assembled by the Chesapeake Monitoring cooperative from volunteer networks and nontraditional partner efforts will expand spatial and temporal resolution of decision-support assessments. The Chesapeake Monitoring Cooperative has developed a Memorandum of Understanding that has been approved by STAR and its workgroups, has support from GITs and Advisory Committees, and is poised to be signed by partnership signatories. Establishing the MOU highlights partner recognition that these new data streams provide information valuable to product development that helps communication, management action targeting and regulatory level assessments with greater spatial and temporal coverage than has been achieved with our traditional investments.

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.06" + Indent at: 0.31", Keep lines together, Tab stops: 0.25", Left

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

¹¹ CBP modeling tools: http://www.chesapeakebay.net/about/programs/watershed_implementation_plan_tools/

¹² USGS SPARROW model: A modeling tool for the regional interpretation of water quality monitoring data. <http://water.usgs.gov/nawqa/sparrow/>

2.4. Quantifying the reductions from pollution control practices and verifying their continued performance

The pollution reduction values associated with nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment controls that the CBP partnership has approved for use in the models are based on extensive literature reviews and expert panel recommendations. Through its technical source sector workgroups and expert panels, the Water Quality Goal Implementation Team¹³ (WQGIT) periodically refines these values based on new information and to take into account innovative practices. The CBP partnership is addressing the effectiveness and efficiency of practices by adopting principles to verify that reported practices are, indeed, in place and functioning as designed; further quantifying the effect of variations in watershed properties (such as different types of soils) on controls; quantifying changes in Best Management Practices (BMP) performance over time; and evaluating the potential future impacts of climate change on BMP performance.

In addition, the Chesapeake Bay basinwide BMP verification framework provides a structure by which the Bay Program partners will improve consistency through a collective analysis of the effectiveness and efficiency of various BMPs. Verification will be viewed as a life cycle process, including initial inspection, follow up checks, and evaluation of BMP performance¹⁴.

3.5. Enhancing the next generation of decision support tools (Phase 6 and Phase 7)

The CBP partnership ~~has revised is currently revising~~ the watershed modeling system structure to enhance decision support and to improve accuracy, transparency and confidence. The Phase 6 suite of decision support tools ~~has been will be~~ refined in many ways, including the ~~addition of ten additional years of real-time water quality monitoring data, high-resolution land cover data, new data inputs from the agricultural community, additional BMPs, and an approach to integrate multiple models into the Phase 6 decision support tools¹⁵, addition of simulation years, monitoring stations and updated BMP efficiencies~~. Further incremental updates to the Phase 6 suite of modeling tools will take place concurrently with the two-year milestone schedule beginning in late 2019. These incremental updates will include Partnership-approved inclusion of new BMPs available for planning and reporting purposes, and incremental updates to land use information and optimization tools for cost-effective BMP planning. The CBP partnership will also consider additional refinements to develop Phase 7 decision support tools for 2025 and beyond. Among other refinements, the Phase 7 decision support tools may integrate further optimization tools, including tools to assess BMP effects on multiple CBP partnership priorities beyond water quality.

4. Revisiting watershed model calibration methods with the goal of improving local watershed results

Different calibration methods will be assessed for the calibration of flow, sediment and nutrients; a precipitation data set for the entire Phase 6 simulation period from 1985 to 2011 will be developed, applied and calibrated; new calibration stations allowed by the expansion of the

Commented [PL6]: This is done...perhaps Phase 7 and the optimization system?

Commented [WM7]: Calibration of the Phase 6 model was removed as a factor and added to the Current Efforts section

¹³ http://www.chesapeakebay.net/groups/group/Water_Quality_Goal_Implementation_Team

¹⁴ <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/documents/Complete%20CBP%20BMP%20Verification%20Framework%20with%20Appendices.pdf>

¹⁵ https://www.chesapeakebay.net/documents/Phase_6_Modeling_Tools_1-page_factsheet_12-18-17.pdf

~~simulation period will be applied and calibrated; and assessment in the changes that are due only to the change in the hydrology calibration will be quantified and documented.~~

6. Ongoing Reviewing and verification ~~ting of updating~~ historical implementation data ~~that has been~~ submitted by the jurisdictions to the CBP partnership, confirming that BMPs are still in place and ensuring that accurate information is included in the modeling tools

Information on BMP implementation ~~was submitted and reviewed to ensure maximum accuracy for that is accurate as possible is integral to~~ calibrating the Phase 6 Watershed Model; planning and reporting on future actions; using monitoring data to assess impacts of past efforts, since understanding the factors affecting observed trends in water quality requires a clear understanding of what actions have been implemented over time; and assessing the critical period of 1993-1995¹⁶. ~~BMP implementation historical data submitted by the jurisdictions is available on Phase 6 CAST as annual progress.¹⁷ States may resubmit historical BMP implementation data if needed during two-year milestone periods, beginning in late 2019. Ongoing inspection and verification of historical implementation data will allow continued assessments of impacts of past efforts in order to enhance understanding of current conditions and efforts required to reach 2025 nutrient and sediment targets.~~

Commented [PL8]: Outdated.

7. Support the ongoing need for synthesis and communications of science findings and needs

~~Through the mid-point assessment there was significant partnership investment in updating the science that underpinned advances in modeling, monitoring and management tools and assessments. Substantial publication efforts were initiated under the mid-point assessment. While key products were provided, the need for additional synthesis and communications of new findings remains to explain factors affecting water quality trends and linkages between sources and ecosystem response to support adaptive management.~~

Formatted: numbered list

8. Consider co-benefits for the following selected set of CBP outcomes:

- o **Improving Habitats:** Outcomes for fish habitat, brook trout, wetlands, submerged aquatic vegetation, forest buffers, forest canopy, stream health
- o **Reducing Toxic contaminants:** Outcomes for Policy and Prevention & Research
- o **Conserving Lands:** Outcomes for healthy watersheds and protected lands
- o **Addressing Climate Resiliency:** Outcomes for adaptation and monitoring
- o **Public Access**

Formatted: List Paragraph, Line spacing: Multiple 1.08 li, Bulleted + Level: 2 + Aligned at: 0.75" + Indent at: 1"

~~5. The CBP will need to develop improved understanding of the potential benefits, and risks, for practices and policies to provide benefits to multiple outcomes. Existing technical tools (such as CAST) will have to be greatly expanded, and new tools may need to be developed, to provide the information for decision makers can consider practices that provide benefits for multiple outcomes."~~

Formatted: List Paragraph, Line spacing: Multiple 1.08 li

Commented [WM9]: Minor updates to suggested text from Scott Phillips

Formatted: Font: Bold

¹⁶ http://www.epa.gov/reg3wapd/pdf/pdf_chesbay/FinalBayTMDL/AppendixGCriticalPeriodAnalysis_final.pdf

¹⁷ <https://cast.chesapeakebay.net/>

Response of Water Quality Conditions to Management Practices

1.9. Understanding the factors affecting the ecosystem response to pollutant load reductions to focus management efforts and strategies

Based on the current science and the associated CBP modeling system, the CBP partnership has projected that implementing practices for reducing nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment loads should achieve applicable water quality standards in the Bay. Improved understanding of the following elements could further enhance decision-making for the Phase III WIPs: (1) the factors affecting the time it will take to see improvements (i.e., "lag times") between implementation of practices and responses in water quality; (2) factors in addition to nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment pollutant load reduction that affect response of DO, clarity, SAV and chlorophyll; (3) the relationships between water quality improvements and the recovery of habitat conditions for fish and shellfish populations; (4) how population changes and economic influences impact restoration activities; (5) the effects of climate change due to increased temperatures and sea level rise in the estuary; (6) how increases in plant and animal biomass in response to improved water quality improves the assimilative capacity of the system for nutrients and sediment; and (7) an improved understanding of uncertainty associated with model projections.

Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.06" + Indent at: 0.31"

2.10. Factoring in effects from continued climate change

EPA and other partners are developing the tools to quantify the effects of changes in watershed flows, storm intensity and changes in hypoxia due to increased temperatures and sea level rise in the estuary. Current efforts are to frame an initial future climate change scenario based on estimated 2050 conditions. The CBP partnership ~~will need to decide~~ if or when to incorporate these climate change considerations into the Phase III WIPs, by including a narrative strategy that describes the state and local jurisdictions' current action plans and strategies to address climate change and commit to adopting climate change targets by 2021. The current preliminary modeling estimates attributable to climate change by 2025 are roughly an additional 9 million pounds of nitrogen and 0.5 million pounds of phosphorus. Starting with the 2022-2023 milestones, the partnership will determine how climate change will impact BMPs included in the WIPs and address vulnerabilities in the two-year milestones.

3.11. Assessing the implementation potential of filter feeders for nutrient and sediment reductions

Living resource restoration was not considered in the Bay TMDL because low filter feeder biomass was insufficient to influence water quality, and because of future biomass uncertainty due to harvest, disease and lack of habitat. Since then, significant oyster restoration has occurred and more is planned, as well as a recent resurgence of aquaculture in the Chesapeake Bay. The oyster model will be revised as necessary to incorporate aquaculture operations and additional oyster biomass brought about by restoration activities including sanctuaries. Eight tributaries in Maryland and Virginia have been selected for oyster reef restoration including development of a tributary restoration plan, construction and seeding reefs, and monitoring and evaluating restored reefs¹⁸.

Commented [JW10]: Is this now 10?

Commented [WM11R10]: This is #11

4.12. Addressing Examining the impact the lower Susquehanna dams have on the pollutant loads to the Bay, including changes over time

¹⁸ <http://www.chesapeakeprogress.com/abundant-life/oysters>

The CBP partnership ~~worked will work~~ with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Lower Susquehanna River Watershed Assessment (LSRWA) study and the STAR midpoint assessment work plan for the assessment of trapping capacity behind dams, especially the Conowingo, as well as greater representation of local impoundments and reservoirs throughout the Phase 6 Watershed Model. The CBP partnership ~~has developed a detailed Conowingo WIP Framework to will need to~~ address how to reduce the level of impairment in the Chesapeake Bay due to Conowingo. ~~A Conowingo WIP Steering Committee will be formed to guide the development and implementation of the Conowingo WIP and financing strategy, and seek final approval of the Conowingo WIP document from the PSC. A Conowingo WIP Steering Committee schedule was approved leading to a final draft Conowingo WIP in March 2019 for public review and comment.~~¹⁹

5.13. Addressing Conducting a detailed multi-year assessment of chlorophyll in the tidal James River using augmented monitoring and modeling approaches

The CBP partnership ~~is working~~ closely with the principal investigators of the James River chlorophyll-a criteria assessment to determine the criteria necessary in order to meet water quality standards in the James River. ~~Criteria could change by becoming more stringent, less stringent or existing criteria is confirmed. A STAC Peer Review for the James River chlorophyll a criteria reevaluation was published in 2016²⁰. The Partnership will support implementation efforts to reach the new James River chlorophyll a criteria by providing ongoing modeling and monitoring support and other technical resources to support implementation.~~

Commented [WM12]: Chl a assessment was also added to current efforts section

Commented [PL13]: Update based on modeling results and decision

V. Current Efforts and Gaps

~~The Phase I and Phase II WIPs and two year milestones include descriptions of Partnership efforts are~~ currently underway or planned to improve tracking, reporting, and assessing the effectiveness of implementation actions. In addition, the Bay watershed jurisdictions are in the process of developing new and revising existing BMP tracking, verification, and reporting protocols and programs. As the CBP tracks partners' progress toward goals for cleaner waters, verifying that practices are being implemented correctly and are reducing nutrient and sediment pollution as expected will be critical in measuring success. EPA, the Bay watershed jurisdictions, local governments, the private sector and nongovernmental organizations ~~will~~ use these data to inform accountability and adaptive decision-making, and redirect management actions and resources.

~~The WIPs also evaluate the current legal, regulatory, programmatic, financial, staffing and technical capacity to deliver the implementation of reductions sufficient to achieve the target loads in the Bay TMDL. As part of their evaluation, the Bay watershed jurisdictions considered whether additional reductions could be achieved with existing capacity (funding, authorities and sustainability). The evaluation of existing capacity includes programs and rules, a comprehensive assessment of current~~

¹⁹ https://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/26045/actions.decisions_final_03.02.18_clean.pdf.

²⁰ https://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/26045/iv.b._conowingo_draft_framework_.pdf

https://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/24591/20161107_final_stacjamesriverchlorophyllcriteria_reviewreport.pdf

point source permitting/treatment upgrade schedules and funding programs, nonpoint source control funding, existing permitting and incentive-based programs and regulations.

Specific efforts include the use of the National Environmental Information Exchange Network (NEIEN) to seamlessly exchange information between existing federal, state or district databases and the suite of CBP decision support tools. Tracking data and models will be used, along with ambient monitoring data, to assess WIP and milestone commitments and progress.

Formatted: No bullets or numbering

The Phase 6 Watershed model calibration was completed in 2017. Different calibration methods were assessed for the calibration of flow, sediment and nutrients; a precipitation data set for the entire Phase 6 simulation period from 1985 to 2011 was developed, applied and calibrated; new calibration stations allowed by the expansion of the simulation period were applied and calibrated; and the changes that are due only to the change in the hydrology calibration were assessed, quantified and documented. A summary of the calibration results is available through the CBP Modeling Team web page²¹. A comparison of the WRTDS data and the Phase 6 calibration data are available on the CAST nontidal water quality dashboard.²²

Historical implementation data submitted by the jurisdictions was reviewed and updated by the CBP partnership, confirming that BMPs are still in place and ensuring that accurate information is included in the modeling tools. Information on BMP implementation was submitted and reviewed to ensure maximum accuracy for calibrating the Phase 6 Watershed Model; planning and reporting on future actions; using monitoring data to assess impacts of past efforts, since understanding the factors affecting observed trends in water quality requires a clear understanding of what actions have been implemented over time; and assessing the critical period of 1993-1995²³.

Formatted: Body Text

Commented [PL14]: Outdated.

The CBP partnership also worked with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Lower Susquehanna River Watershed Assessment (LSRWA) study and the STAR midpoint assessment work plan for the assessment of trapping capacity behind dams, especially the Conowingo, as well as greater representation of local impoundments and reservoirs throughout the Phase 6 Watershed Model.

~~The WIPs also evaluate the current legal, regulatory, programmatic, financial, staffing and technical capacity to deliver the implementation of reductions sufficient to achieve the target loads in the Bay TMDL. As part of their evaluation, the Bay watershed jurisdictions considered whether additional reductions could be achieved with existing capacity (funding, authorities and sustainability). The evaluation of existing capacity includes programs and rules, a comprehensive assessment of current point source permitting/treatment upgrade schedules and funding programs, nonpoint source control funding, existing permitting and incentive-based programs and regulations.~~

The jurisdictions and EPA, through the WIPs and evaluations of the WIPs, respectively, identified gaps between their current capacity and the capacity they estimate is necessary to fully attain the interim

²¹ https://www.chesapeakebay.net/who/group/modeling_team

²² <https://cast.chesapeakebay.net/documentation/NonTidalWaterQualityDashboard>

²³ http://www.epa.gov/req3wapd/pdf/pdf_chesbay/FinalBayTMDL/AppendixGCriticalPeriodAnalysis_final.pdf

and final nutrient and sediment target loads for each of the 92 segments of the Bay TMDL. Such gaps that the jurisdictions continue to address include:

- Financial capacity to oversee and implement MS4 and other stormwater programs
- Financial, technical and regulatory capacity to deliver priority conservation practices to priority watersheds
- BMP tracking, verification and reporting programs

Necessary new capacity to address these capacity gaps and others includes additional incentives, new or enhanced state or local regulatory programs, market-based tools, technical or financial assistance and new legislative authorities. It also includes capacity from other federal agencies, local governments, the private sector and/or non-governmental organizations.

The Bay watershed jurisdictions are expected to discuss plans to work with federal, local, private sector and nonprofit partners to leverage capacity for achieving interim and final load targets. The WIPs identify contingency strategies in the event that actions by those partners, or by the jurisdictions, do not occur. For example, if an enhanced cost-share program does not yield adequate participation and compliance rates, a jurisdiction might pursue the development of enhanced authorities or new regulations to control loadings from that same source sector or another source sector.

The Bay watershed jurisdictions are now focused on developing the Phase III WIPs, and on implementation of management practices identified in their WIPs and two-year milestones. Federal agencies also are focused on implementing their Executive Order strategies and two-year milestones.

For specific WIP commitments, each jurisdiction's WIP is posted on their respective websites:

- New York State Department of Environmental Quality
- Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection
- West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection
- Maryland Department of the Environment
- Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control
- DC Department of Energy and Environment

Some Phase III WIP considerations include: of the WIP commitments and contingencies include:

- Committing to more stringent nitrogen and phosphorus limits at wastewater treatment plants, including on the James River in Virginia. (Virginia, New York, Delaware, District of Columbia)
- Pursuing state legislation to fund wastewater treatment plant upgrades, urban stormwater management and agricultural programs. (Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia)
- Implementing a progressive stormwater permit to reduce pollution. (District of Columbia)
- Conservation districts throughout the Bay watershed will conduct farm visits to inform farmers of their regulatory requirements and help farmers identify ways they can improve conservation methods on their properties. (Pennsylvania)
- Investing in a Regional Agricultural Watershed Assessment Program to inspect farms and assist farmers in meeting their regulatory requirements for planning and installation of BMPs. (Pennsylvania)
- Committing to pollution reduction plans as part of the MS4 permitting process. (Pennsylvania)

Formatted: Bullet

Chesapeake Bay Management Strategy
2017 WIP, 2025 WIP and Water Quality Standards Attainment
& Monitoring Outcomes

- ~~Considering implementation of mandatory programs for agriculture if pollution reductions fall behind schedule. (Delaware, Maryland, Virginia)~~
- ~~Developing local planning goals to implement Phase III WIP commitments at the local level in the Chesapeake Bay watershed jurisdictions.~~
- ~~Addressing climate resiliency approaches in the jurisdictions' Phase III WIP narratives~~
- ~~Including considerations in planning process for ecosystem services and co-benefits of BMPs in addition to nutrient and sediment reductions.~~

Additional policies, programs, or actions include:

- ~~Enforceable or otherwise binding commitments that controls will be, or are already being, implemented and maintained.~~
- ~~Permits or contracts with quantifiable limits and milestones that the jurisdictions can demonstrate are consistent with the Bay TMDL's wasteload and load allocations.~~
- ~~Estimates of the necessary resources (funds, technical assistance, permit reviewers, inspectors) to support implementation and maintenance of practices.~~
- ~~Documentation of historic participation and compliance rates associated with existing programs and practices and successful nutrient and sediment management efforts.~~

There are several current efforts to address the water quality standards attainment and monitoring outcome. The CBP oversees the tidal and nontidal monitoring networks, which are used to (1) assess in tidal waters relative to established water quality standards and (2) measure nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment in the watershed to help determine if practices are reducing loads to the Bay and in the watershed. The tidal monitoring network is a cooperative effort between EPA, MD and VA. The watershed monitoring is a partnership between USGS, EPA, and all seven Bay watershed jurisdictions. The primary monitoring gaps include (1) more frequent measures [and greater spatial resolution](#) of dissolved oxygen [and chlorophyll *a*](#) to assess criteria attainment, [\(2\) expanding annual spatial coverage for water clarity acres assessments to the baywide scale,](#) and [\(23\) more localized monitoring in watershed areas to assess effects of BMPs.](#) The CBP water quality monitoring is coordinated through STAR and more information on the networks and efforts to address the gaps are in the Management Approach and Monitoring Progress sections of this document.

To support the Mid-Point Assessment, the USGS and UMCES provided leadership and -worked with the STAR team to coordinate efforts of with multiple investigators, on a project to assess and explain water-quality conditions, which had these objectives:

- Analyze water quality trends in the Bay and its watershed.
- Explain the factors affecting water quality trends in Bay and its watershed.
- Enhance CBP models using the improved understanding of trends.
- Inform management strategies to improve water quality.

Selected accomplishments for each objective include:

Objective 1: Developing new approaches to assess tidal trends using the General Additive Model (GAMs) techniques. Updating status and trends for watershed using information from the CBP nontidal network, and providing new analysis of estuary trends with the GAMs approach

Commented [PL15]: Are these still current and relevant?

Commented [WM16R15]: From Nicki Kasi: I would take all this out and refer them to each state's website link for the WIP. This is all out of date and will be out of date again the minute the milestones are updated.

If you believe language is needed here, then I would re-write this whole section to paraphrase it around the EPA Expectations

Commented [WM17R15]: Links to state WIP web pages included

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"

Objective 2: Conducting multiple studies, and developing new approaches, to better understand the factors affecting nutrient and sediment trends in the watershed. The findings are being summarized in several major synthesis products:

- Providing explanations of loads and trends at RIM sites to understand changes in waters reaching Chesapeake Bay.
- Describing the influence of Susquehanna reservoirs on loads and water quality in the Chesapeake Bay.
- Explaining yields and trends at sites throughout the Chesapeake Bay watershed to support management decisions as part of the mid-point assessment.
- Reviewing sediment sources, transport, delivery, and impacts in the Chesapeake Bay watershed to guide management actions.

Additionally, there was a synthesis product on the understanding and implications of the Reservoirs on the Lower Susquehanna River.

The estuary investigators also conducted multiple studies which are being summarized in these syntheses products:

- (1) Estuarine water quality: Conceptual models and case studies of eutrophication and restoration
- (2) Factors affecting Chesapeake SAV distribution and abundance
- (3) Explaining estuarine water clarity trends: physical, biological, and watershed influences
- (4) Factors affecting changes in tidal Potomac River water quality
- (5) Linking segment-scale patterns in water quality criteria attainment with station-scale water quality trends
- (6) Tidal water quality trends: tributary summary reports
- (7) STAC workshop report related to the meeting: “Integrating Recent Findings to Explain Water Quality Change: Support for the Mid-Point Assessment and Beyond”

Objective 3: The STAR team brought results forward on important watershed processes that were used to develop the Phase 6 Watershed Model (WSM). Some of the major findings included:

- Developing approaches to represent groundwater lag times into the watershed model
- Improved information on transport of nitrogen and sediment (using the USGS SPARROW model)
- Better simulating sediment from stream corridors

Objective 4: The USGS and UMCES established the Integrated Trends and Analysis Team (ITAT) under STAR to communicate findings to jurisdictions and science partners. The investigators also made multiple presentations to the WQ GIT and their work groups. The interaction helped the jurisdictions understand the technical findings, which will be used as they develop their Phase III WIPs.

Additional efforts were begun to summarize and communicate findings from the above objectives, specifically for informing management decisions during Phase III WIP development. A framework was developed for integrating, synthesizing and communicating the messages and conclusions from across the objectives at relevant geographic scales into locally meaningful storylines to demonstrate to managers how the information could be used to inform decisions. This storyline framework was presented to multiple groups within the CBP including the WQGIT, STAC, CAC and ITAT. The CBP also developed Phase III WIP technical workshops to present the explaining trends work and storylines to

Commented [WM18]: Suggested text from Scott Phillips

jurisdictions and other entities involved in WIP development. The storyline framework is also being used to inform the tributary summary reports, and is being utilized by Pennsylvania DEP to generate county-level toolboxes for WIP development. The CBP is currently developing an interactive web-based decision support tool that will allow users to access the data and the messages and conclusions generated and compiled from the above explaining trends objectives, and to utilize this information to inform management decisions. The tool is directed towards both technical and non-technical managers and environmental planners from the local to jurisdictional levels. The WQGIT is utilizing the storyline framework in a GIT-funded project to develop a portion of this web-based tool that will allow users to choose data and visuals to build their own storyline analysis and presentation for their area of interest.

In addition to the storyline framework, a story map communication product is under development which aims to communicate the significance of local decisions in terms of impacts downstream in the estuary. The “Local Solutions, Big Impacts” story map can be used by local governments and planning jurisdictions to communicate how local water quality improvements ultimately lead to a cleaner Chesapeake Bay.

In addition to developing new methods for assessing tidal water quality trends using GAMs techniques, the CBP has begun developing new methods for assessing incremental progress towards water quality standards attainment, for assessing trends in estimated water quality standards attainment over time, and for analyzing the spatio-temporal changes in estimated water quality standards attainment. In 2017 the EPA CBPO published the sixth Technical Addendum for Water Quality Criteria to update the Bay-wide criteria assessment procedure factoring in new science²⁴. The 2017 addendum also documents the CBP’s development of a multi-metric water quality indicator using the water quality criteria attainment assessment results for dissolved oxygen, water clarity/underwater bay grasses and chlorophyll *a*, to support public reporting of progress toward achievement of the jurisdictions’ Chesapeake Bay water quality criteria.

Commented [WM19]: I’m fine with including John’s additi

Formatted: Normal, No bullets or numbering

Commented [TE20]: Peter – is this the right way to say this?

Additionally – is the rolled up indicator work new enough to be worth mentioning here? I’m not sure when we developed that.

Commented [TE21]: We should add footnote with link: https://www.chesapeakebay.net/documents/2017_Nov_ChesBayWQ_Criteria_Addendum_Final.pdf

Commented [WM22R21]: Footnote inserted

VI. Management Approaches

The CBP partnership will work together to carry out the following actions and strategies to achieve the water quality goals. These approaches seek to address the factors affecting our ability to meet the goal and the gaps identified above.

Phase I WIPs, Phase II WIPs, Phase III WIPs and Two-Year Milestones

The overall management approach needed for reducing nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment are provided in the Bay TMDL document, the Phase I and II WIPs, and the accountability framework, which is described in the Bay TMDL document and Executive Order 13508. The Bay watershed jurisdictions committed to meet the interim (2017) and final (2025) target loads for nutrients and sediment in the Bay through their respective WIPs. The Phase III WIPs will describe how the seven Bay watershed

Commented [PL23]: Update to include Phase III WIPs

²⁴ https://www.chesapeakebay.net/documents/2017_Nov_ChesBayWQ_Criteria_Addendum_Final.pdf


jurisdictions, in collaboration with local partners, will refine, as necessary, the actions and controls that will be implemented between 2018 and 2025 to meet their final load reduction targets. Attainment of final target loads across the watershed is expected to result in the achievement of all applicable nutrient- and sediment-related water quality standards in the Bay and its tidal tributaries.

Chesapeake Bay TMDL Accountability Framework

The Bay TMDL is supported by a rigorous accountability framework to ensure cleanup commitments are established and met, including WIPs, short and long-term benchmarks (such as two-year milestones), a tracking and accountability system for jurisdictions' activities and federal contingency actions that may be employed if jurisdictions do not meet their milestone and WIP commitments. Federal agencies are directed by Executive Order 13508 to consult with the seven Bay watershed jurisdictions to ensure that federal actions to protect and restore the Chesapeake Bay are closely coordinated with those actions by state and local jurisdictions in the watershed. The federal agencies have developed an Executive Order Strategy to outline ways to accomplish that goal. EPA and other federal agencies will also continue to develop water quality two-year milestones. This includes USDA which will report in the biennial workplan on their plans and progress in applying new conservation practices in high priority watersheds.

Although the accountability framework is not part of the Bay TMDL, Sections 7 and 10 of the Bay TMDL document describe how the accountability framework helps provide reasonable assurance that the needed pollutant reductions will occur and how adaptive management can be used as a tool to implement those pollutant reductions within the accountability framework.

Overview of Accountability Process



As part of its efforts to carry out the Bay TMDL accountability framework, EPA interacts with the jurisdictions directly and through the CBP's WQGIT and its associated source sector workgroups. The WQGIT workgroups are focused on supporting the reduction of nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment pollutant loads from key sources described in Section 4 of the Bay TMDL: wastewater, agriculture, urban storm water, septic systems, forests and air. EPA also works with the jurisdictions and the WQGIT on issues associated with two-year milestones, offsets and water quality trading. The WQGIT is supported

by the CBP STAR team, which contains the modeling and monitoring workgroups, and other Goal Implementation Teams, as necessary. The CBP partnership's models are used to assist the jurisdictions in assessing different options for management practices in the formulation of their WIPs and two-year milestone commitments.

Enhancing Monitoring

To address limitations of the existing tidal monitoring program to obtaining measurements at temporal scales required to assess water quality standards, the Partnership CBP is asked to support a Memorandum of Understanding that addresses the use of new data streams of known quality (e.g., Citizen Science and nontraditional partner data sets). New data streams may enhance temporal data resolution at existing stations in the tidal monitoring network. However, these enhancements to data collections can also support greater spatial coverage that reduces uncertainty and improves estimates of water quality conditions. Citizen science and nontraditional partner monitoring in the watershed is expected to assist in understanding local to regional-level spatial distributions of hot spots for nutrients, sediments, contaminants and biology that can be used to guide targeting for limited resources in managing restoration efforts. Incorporating new partners with advanced technology and related protocols for assessing baywide scales of conditions at high resolution are further being pursued (e.g., NASA evaluations of satellite imagery for water clarity related measures). New science on monitoring (e.g., Bever et al. 2018) proposes alternative monitoring strategies that could be adopted if adequate in situ technology to obtain measurement profiles in the bay in realtime can be achieved. Pilot studies of such technology are being proposed and pursued through the GIT-funding competition.

The WQGIT and STAR also are enhancing the monitoring and analysis to address the factors affecting annual loads, responses in living resources, and efforts underway to improve monitoring programs, including:

Water Quality Monitoring System understanding: The CBP partnership conducts annual monitoring of river flow to the Bay to help explain yearly changes in DO, clarity/SAV, and chlorophyll-a conditions. Living resources monitoring is used to assess changes in populations of lower trophic levels (SAV and invertebrates) and fisheries (crabs, oysters and selected finfish species) that are dependent on habitat conditions. The CBP nontidal water quality monitoring program monitors nutrient and sediment at 115 sites in the watershed to help document and understand the factors affecting the response to management practices. The WQGIT and STAR intend to:

- Evolve the business strategy supporting the water quality monitoring program to sustain the work that provides existing outputs and target growth opportunities. Recognizing that the tidal monitoring program operates at marginal needs for water quality standards attainment assessments (USEPA 2003), and anticipated level funding future of monitoring, further work in needed to evolve monitoring strategies that support enhanced collection and analysis of tidal monitoring data to assess progress toward water quality standards.
- ~~— Expand the small watershed monitoring network and assessment of data to better evaluate BMP efficiency.~~
- ~~— Explore the development of a shallow groundwater monitoring network to understand the effect of septic systems on water quality and to better understand contribution to surface water loads and response time between BMP implementation and water quality improvements~~

Commented [PT24]: Is this something we are definitely doing? I never hear about a definite groundwater monitoring program for the watershed, only sporadic studies.

~~Conduct an analysis of water quality changes to better understand and explain the factors affecting water quality response to BMPs and report findings. This analysis will evaluate how nutrient and sediment transport cause lag times between implementing practices and water quality changes. This analysis will build on the USGS report on lessons learned about water quality improvements (2014 New Insights report).~~

~~Monitored Loads and Trends: The CBP partners and USGS operate the River Input Stations to monitor and help assess annual loads of nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment to the Bay which are used to explain changes in estuary water quality conditions. New techniques are being developed to improve comparison between the nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment load data collected from the monitoring stations to TMDL allocations, which were established using the modeling tools. These techniques will be implemented at additional sites in the CBP nontidal network where possible.~~

The STAR team is continuing a project to better measure and explain progress toward water quality improvements. This project will generate and improve understanding of the factors affecting system response (the Bay and its watershed) to implementation of management practices. STAR (under the CBP Modeling Workgroup) is also pursuing with the Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) approaches to reduce uncertainties for models. Additional efforts to enhance monitoring are described in the Monitoring Progress section of this document.

In addition, two types of air deposition are monitored daily and tracked through the CBP models. The first is wet deposition, which occurs during precipitation events and contributes only to nitrogen loads during days of rain or snow. The other is dry deposition, which occurs continuously and is input at a constant rate daily into the Bay Watershed and Bay Water Quality models.

The CBP partnership also has a basinwide reporting process for tracking implementation of management practices. Many of these monitoring and assessment activities are coordinated through and provided by the CBP's STAR team and partner science entities. The CBP partnership, through STAC, conducted a review of its monitoring programs in 2009 to better align efforts with the implementation of the Bay TMDL and WIPs and plans for future evaluation to determine if changes in the monitoring programs are needed and to address the goal teams' needs. Findings from this 2009 review will be used to improve CBP model simulations to inform the development of the Bay jurisdictions' Phase III WIPs by 2018.

STAR is working with the WQGIT to develop an approach to integrate three key pieces of related water quality information to better assess and communicate progress toward meeting the goals of the Bay TMDL and associated water quality standards including:

- Reductions of nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment by source, jurisdiction and overall load reduction associated with the implementation of BMPs. These load reductions are estimates from the CBP models based on BMP implementation data submitted by the jurisdictions.
- Changes of in-stream nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment concentrations and loads as estimated by flow-adjusted trends of nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment. These estimates show long-term (25 year) and shorter term (10 year) changes by normalizing the annual effects of streamflow

Commented [PT25]: If this is a charge to the WQGIT and STAR, lets gameplan on how we formalize this. If we are formalizing it, it needs a defined home to make it happen. Thanks!

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.25", No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Body Text Indent

Commented [TE26]: I have in my notes that we are getting rid of these parts

Commented [WM27R26]: Removing these from draft final strategy

Formatted: Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5"

variability. The normalized estimates are based on monitoring data collected as part of the CBP nontidal water quality monitoring program.

- Attainment of Chesapeake water quality standards for dissolved oxygen, chlorophyll-a, water clarity/SAV standards. Attainment of these standards is based primarily on results from the CBP tidal water quality monitoring program.

Formatted: Bullet, Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5"

Enhanced analysis

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Bold, Underline

The projects conducted leading up to the Midpoint Assessment to explain trends in the Bay and its watershed laid the groundwork for additional analyses that can enhance our understanding of factors affecting water quality and ecosystem responses to management actions. New and continued work in these areas will allow us to better track, assess and model change due to management efforts in the tidal waters and the watershed, and to better understand how these systems are connected. The following approaches will be taken to enhance our ability to explain change:

Formatted: Normal, No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Normal, Indent: Left: 0"

- Continued and enhanced development of metrics to assess change, such as GAMs for tidal water quality trends, including salinity or flow-adjustment and modeling predictors to analyze factors influencing tidal water quality trends.
- Analyses that compare monitoring results with model outputs to identify drivers of inconsistencies and assess the ability to account for these drivers to improve models in the future.
- Enhanced and continued synthesis projects that utilize interdisciplinary teams to:
 - a. Explain change in water quality or ecosystem response in terms of management efforts or actions
 - b. Employ statistical methods or models to assess and quantify interactions
 - c. Analyze linkages between the watershed and the tidal water
 - d. Communicate findings on management-relevant timeframes

Formatted: Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5"

Formatted

Formatted: List Paragraph, Line spacing: Multiple 1.08 li, Bulleted + Level: 2 + Aligned at: 0.75" + Indent at: 1"

To address our understanding of the factors affecting achievement of the water quality outcomes, several efforts have been undertaken. The STAR team has set up is continuing a project to better measure and explain progress toward water quality improvements. This project will generate and improve understanding of the factors affecting system response (the Bay and its watershed) to implementation of management practices. STAR (under the CBP Modeling Workgroup) is also pursuing with the Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) approaches to reduce uncertainties for models. Additional efforts to enhance monitoring are described in the Monitoring Progress section of this document.

Bay TMDL's 2017 Midpoint Assessment Phase III WIP Implementation

Commented [PL28]: Deleted Paragraph from the Bay TMDL's 2017 Midpoint Assessment

There are several other programmatic, management and implementation efforts underway to help achieve attainment of the water quality outcomes. These efforts are being addressed under the Bay TMDL's 2017 midpoint assessment through implementation of Phase III WIPs. The Bay TMDL document calls for an assessment in 2017 to review our progress toward meeting the nutrient and sediment pollutant load reductions identified in the 2010 Bay TMDL, Phase I and II WIPs and two-year milestones.

In 2018, EPA expects the jurisdictions to develop Phase III WIPs following this midpoint assessment of progress in 2017. The final Phase III planning targets will inform Phase III WIP development and implementation. These Phase III WIPs will describe the actions jurisdictions will take to have all practices on the ground by 2025 to achieve their respective Phase III planning targets²⁵.

To assist the jurisdictions in implementing these parts of the Phase III WIPs, the CBP Partnership will work to:

- Develop enhanced understanding of BMP performance, siting and design under climate change conditions
- Provide technical Assistance & Funding to the Bay jurisdictions in Phase III WIP implementation
- Develop and implement a BMP verification program
- Continue to maintain and update Phase 6 modeling tools to reflect advances in understanding and support jurisdictions' implementation planning and tracking.

Formatted: Bullet

The midpoint assessment provides the partnership with the opportunity to step back and assess how the Bay TMDL and WIP implementation are making a difference, if it's all working as intended, and if there's a better way we can implement our priorities and achieve our goals. The ultimate goal is to make implementation more streamlined and the challenges to implementation more understandable for the CBP partnership as we move toward 2017 and 2025.

The WQGIT, STAR, the source sector workgroups and the Modeling Workgroup have developed work plans to guide their efforts under each of the midpoint assessment priorities. Those work plans can be accessed here: http://www.chesapeakebay.net/groups/group/Water_Quality_Goal_Implementation_Team.

Approaches Targeted to Local Participation

- Much of the implementation of the pollution reduction practices, as articulated in the Bay TMDL and the WIPs, will be carried out at the local level. This includes municipalities, counties, soil and water conservation districts and local private sector groups and individuals. Therefore, management approaches should be designed to include timely dialogue with the responsible local agencies and other partners, taking into consideration funding and technical support required by these local partners.
- The Chesapeake Bay jurisdictions will develop local planning goals from the Phase III Planning Targets released in July 2018. The CBP partnership is currently exploring how to express programmatic and implementation goals at the local level in the Phase 6 modeling tools²⁶ (including CAST/MAST/VAST/BayFAST) as part of the midpoint assessment. The local planning goals will be reflected in the Phase III WIPs. The local planning goals are intended to enhance planning and implementation efforts at the local level.
- The CBP Partnership will update the high-resolution land cover dataset every four years between 2018 and 2025, using state and local data from the CBP Partnership jurisdictions. The collection of refined land use and land cover data from the local jurisdictions for incorporation

Commented [PL29]: Update. High res imagery every few years, local planning goal development, updated growth projections based on state and local data, climate projections based on state and local data. CAST is still relevant

²⁵ <https://www.epa.gov/chesapeake-bay-tmdl/chesapeake-bay-watershed-implementation-plans-wips>

²⁶ <https://cast.chesapeakebay.net/Documentation/PlanningGoals>

into the Phase 6 modeling tools is intended to improve the representation of urban, agricultural, federal and natural lands at the local scale. Trends in land use will be used to refine the future land use projections every two years through 2025. Local land use and growth projections will assist in local planning and implementation of practices to achieve the Phase III planning targets and two-year milestones.

- Further information is needed to fully understand and address local climate change impacts in the Chesapeake Watershed. The CBP Partnership will collect and analyze local data to better understand BMP performance and resilience concerns under climate change conditions. Better understanding of BMP performance and resilience to climate conditions at the local level will assist in climate-smart implementation and programmatic design at the local level. The CBP Partnership will also develop techniques, collect data, and perform studies through 2021 to better understand and predict impacts from climate change to Chesapeake Watershed jurisdictions and local areas. Beginning in 2022, the CBP Partnership will assist the jurisdictions in applying new understandings of climate change impacts in implementation and programmatic practices through 2025.
- Recent investments by the CBP in Citizen Science and nontraditional partner monitoring efforts will help inform management and decision-makers with monitoring assessments, including the effects of management activities. The opportunity to expand the use of ~~sign of~~ Citizen Science new data streams will provide key data for evaluating the work of the management strategies to understand the progress we are making, what gaps remain, and what steps are needed to fill those gaps.

Cross-Outcome Collaboration and Multiple Benefits

- State and local jurisdictions could target the implementation of actions that not only result in water quality benefits, but address other impairments (e.g. bacteria or toxic contaminants), environmental problems (e.g. threatened or endangered species), safety concerns (e.g. flooding, infrastructure) and 2014 Agreement Outcomes (e.g. wetlands, forest buffers) as well. In 2018, an Action Team was created to look at the co-benefits between these outcomes and the Phase III WIP. While co-benefits could be identified for the majority of the 2014 Agreement Outcomes, the Action Team identified the top twelve that appeared to have a stronger link to the WIP; either through their ability to facilitate messaging or to enhance implementation of the WIPs. Using the results of a comprehensive report which qualitatively ranked BMPs available in the Phase 5.3.2 modeling tools according to their benefits developed by the CBP WQGIT and Habitat GIT, the Action Team created a series of two-page fact sheets for these 12 high-priority outcomes. They also included narrative descriptions from experts in the relevant GITs and workgroups on considerations for addressing these priority outcomes in Phase III WIP development, selection and siting of BMPs, and resources for additional decision-support tools and points of contact in each jurisdiction. The report, fact sheets, and additional resources are available on Phase 6 CAST (see footnote)²⁷.

Commented [PL30]: Expand on this to include the materials and effort led by Nicki Kasi on BMP co-benefits.

Commented [WM31]: Nicki led this group that developed the fact sheets, I'll take her suggestions for what to include here.

Commented [WM32R31]: Agreed with some minor changes.

²⁷ <https://cast.chesapeakebay.net/Documentation/DevelopPlans>

The qualitative rankings are currently being incorporated into an interactive web-based tool, which will allow users to explore, rank, sort and filter scores across individual BMPs, Watershed Agreement Outcomes, and BMP sectors. In 2017, the CBP WQGIT and Habitat GIT oversaw the development of a comprehensive report which qualitatively ranked BMPs available in the Phase 5.3.2 modeling tools according to their benefits to 2014 Watershed Agreement outcomes and other concerns (including flooding, bacteria, drinking water, and economic development). A series of two-page fact sheets for 12 high-priority outcomes were developed using these qualitative rankings, and included narrative descriptions from experts in the relevant GITs and workgroups on considerations for addressing these priority outcomes in Phase III WIP development, selection and siting of BMPs, and resources for additional decision-support tools and points of contact in each jurisdiction. The report, fact sheets, and additional resources are available on Phase 6 CAST (see footnote)²⁸. Text for first bullet: The qualitative rankings are currently being incorporated into an interactive web-based tool, which will allow users to explore, rank, sort and filter scores across individual BMPs, Watershed Agreement Outcomes, and BMP sectors.

Formatted: List Paragraph, Line spacing: Multiple 1.08
li

- The CBP partnership is currently exploring the development of an optimization tool for TMDL implementation purposes, but this tool could potentially capture a broader range of ecosystem benefits beyond water quality to help inform decision making in our restoration efforts.
- The CBP partnership is currently exploring the development of an ecosystem services framework for BMP selection, planning and implementation. This potential framework would provide additional decision support to state and local jurisdictions in addressing local concerns and goals through the TMDL implementation process.
- Identify and Prioritize Options for toxic contaminant mitigation, that have co-benefits with nutrient and sediment reduction practices, to inform policy and prevention (cross-outcome collaboration with Toxic Contaminants Research). The TCW needs to identify and prioritize mitigation options to help inform policy and prevention strategies and have co-benefits with nutrient and sediment reductions. Both PCBs and mercury have widespread extent and severity and also cause fish consumption advisories, so they are being addressed first for mitigation options. For other contaminants and their mixture, the TCW will use the information from previous approach on landscape settings to identify and prioritize mitigation options. Work activities will include:
 - a. Studies of mitigating contaminants in different landscape settings
 - b. Determine the efficiencies of some management practices to reduce selected contaminants
 - c. Explore the use of existing nutrient and sediment tools (such as CAST and watershed model) to address selected contaminants.
 - d. Interact with WQ GIT teams on opportunities to achieve co-benefits between nutrient and sediment practice and contaminant reductions.

Formatted

²⁸ <https://cast.chesapeakebay.net/Documentation/DevelopPlans>

- e. Information generated from the research strategy, will be continuously shared with the TCW, and key source WG of the WQ GIT (WWTPs, storm water, and agricultural) so they can consider options for mitigation impacts of toxic contaminants.
- The CBP will compile the list of science needs identified from SRS quarterly meetings, and combine with the list of GIT science needs gathered by STAR. CBP will analyze these needs in conjunction with the ongoing projects above and other current CBP projects to determine overlaps, gaps, and internal and external resources necessary and available. CBP will make recommendations to STAR and STAC for review on prioritization of Bay Program science needs. Final recommendations on science and resource prioritization will be brought to the Management Board for review.
- Enhanced water quality monitoring will serve to support information needs of the Sustainable Fisheries GIT and its cross-cutting efforts with the Habitat GIT. Hypoxia negatively impacts water quality standards attainment, blue crab habitat, forage species (macroinvertebrates, fish and shellfish) distribution and abundance, fish habitat, fish and benthic macroinvertebrate community health, fishing success, nutrient cycling, and oyster restoration siting. Reducing uncertainty in hypoxic volume estimates improves the power to detect change over time in response to management actions on shorter time scales than can be provided by present data collection strategies. Bottom measurement of temperature, salinity and dissolved oxygen were identified as needs from recent the STAC SAV, blue crab and oyster climate workshops. Improved hypoxic volume resolution would improve habitat characterization needed to support the data being collated for developing Chesapeake Bay regional fish habitat health assessment per the 2018 CBP STAC Workshop findings and recommendations. Improved tracking of hypoxic habitat dynamics in space and time is also highlighted as a desired, cross cutting climate indicator per the 2017-18 climate indicators project by the CRWG. Further monitoring program improvements are being investigated to improve water clarity acres and chlorophyll *a* assessments.

Formatted: List Paragraph, Bulleted + Level: 1 +
Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5"

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Formatted: Font: Italic

Communication & Outreach

- The December 2017 STAC Workshop "Integrating Recent Findings to Explain WaterQuality Change: Support for the Mid-Point Assessment and Beyond" identified a number of recommendations for improving science communication and outreach to CBP partners. The CBP is currently following an number of these recommendations to provide enhanced in-person technical support, to provide technical support to more local entities such as counties or conservation districts, especially those with fewer technical resources, and to provide more consistent scientific and technical outreach to all jurisdictions.
- The CBP will improve access to its scientific and technical information by 1) developing an Open Data site that catalogs, standardizes, organizes, and provides access to its datasets, including geospatial data, and its tools; this Open Data site will work in coordination with the existing CBP Data PortalHub, and 2) by incorporating scientific and technical information into web-based tools designed for users from different geographic resolutions and with different technical backgrounds; these tools may focus on data visualization or decision-support, and will serve to provide access to information as well as guidance on using it.

Continued and more consistent scientific and technical outreach is necessary to provide managers the opportunity to incorporate science into their decision-making. Current outreach efforts surrounding Phase III WIP development should evolve in the future to 1) focus on WIP implementation support, 2) incorporate more cross-outcome technical outreach, and 3) align with management-relevant timelines such as the TMDL Milestones.

Formatted: Normal

VII. Monitoring Progress

2017 WIP Outcome

Practices: Since 2010, the CBP partnership solicits BMP implementation data from the jurisdictions. The WQGIT Watershed Technical Workgroup is responsible for assisting jurisdictions in developing, understanding and submitting data through the NEIEN system. EPA's reporting system, the Bay Tracking and Accounting System, or BayTAS, is used to track progress toward meeting Bay TMDL allocations. WQGIT members have been actively involved in the development of BayTAS. ChesapeakeStat²⁹ is a CBP partnership website that publicly shares information on indicators, strategies and funding including the BayTAS data, BMP implementation data reported through NEIEN and any other numerical data used for assessing progress towards CBP partnership water quality goals. The CBP partnership is working with the jurisdictions and federal partners to improve verification of reported nutrient and sediment controls. The WQGIT also adopted a protocol for reviewing the effectiveness of nutrient and sediment controls, or BMPs, based on an evaluation by expert panels and a review of the best available literature and data. Expert panels evaluating the effectiveness of controls are underway in order to inform the CBP partnership as to whether it is appropriate/necessary to modify existing, or approve new, nutrient and sediment controls and how the implementation of those controls are accounted for by the CBP partnership modeling tools.

Modeled Loads: The CBP partners use a suite of computer models to project pollutant loads and flow. The CBP modeling framework is designed to address questions of how Chesapeake Bay water quality will respond to changes in watershed and airshed management actions, which can inform decision-making for reducing pollution and meeting applicable water quality standards. These modeling tools are also used to track and quantify nutrient and sediment loads as WIP implementation progresses. The estimated modeled loads, together with relevant monitoring data, ~~are~~will be used to track progress with achieving the 2017 (and 2025) WIP outcome. USGS and the modeling workgroup are currently ~~enhancing/developing~~ techniques to better compare modeled nutrient and sediment load data with that of monitored loads.

2025 WIP Outcome

Midpoint Assessment: In addition to assessing progress towards meeting the 2017 WIP outcome, the midpoint assessment will also include an evaluation of the current science to inform and improve the implementation strategies in the Phase III WIPs. The midpoint assessment includes the enhancement of the modeling tools by the CBP partners, led by the Modeling Workgroup, to incorporate the latest science. Specifically, the Modeling Workgroup is charged with revising the watershed modeling system

²⁹ <http://stat.chesapeakebay.net/>

structure to improve transparency, accuracy and confidence. Improved accuracy, in particular, encompasses the incorporation of more refined local land use data.

Water Quality Standards Attainment & Monitoring Outcome

The CBP has extensive tidal and nontidal monitoring networks, which are used to (1) measure nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment in the watershed; (2) assess conditions in tidal waters relative to established water quality standards; and (3) evaluate tidal habitat conditions and living resource populations and health.

Gaps in achieving the recommended levels of monitoring for complete water quality standards attainment assessments have been identified in the program. Nontidal network priorities need to be revisited for station densities and distribution. STAR and its workgroups are coordinating to address gaps and improve spatial and temporal resolution of the assessments. Analysis and synthesis of the watershed and bay monitoring results are essential to understanding and communicating changes through time that supports decision-making and adaptive management.

~~In addition, two types of air deposition are monitored daily and tracked through the CBP models. The first is wet deposition, which occurs during precipitation events and contributes only to nitrogen loads during days of rain or snow. The other is dry deposition, which occurs continuously and is input at a constant rate daily into the Bay Watershed and Bay Water Quality models.~~

~~The CBP partnership also has a basinwide reporting process for tracking implementation of management practices. Many of these monitoring and assessment activities are coordinated through and provided by the CBP's STAR team and partner science entities. The CBP partnership, through STAC, conducted a review of its monitoring programs in 2009 to better align efforts with the implementation of the Bay TMDL and WIPs and plans for future evaluation to determine if changes in the monitoring programs are needed and to address the goal teams' needs. Findings from this 2009 review will be used to improve CBP model simulations to inform the development of the Bay jurisdictions' Phase III WIPs by 2018.~~

~~STAR is working with the WQGIT to develop an approach to integrate three key pieces of related water quality information to better assess and communicate progress toward the Bay TMDL and associated water quality standards including:~~

- ~~■ Reductions of nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment by source, jurisdiction and overall load reduction associated with the implementation of BMPs. These load reductions are estimates from the CBP models based on BMP implementation data submitted by the jurisdictions.~~
- ~~■ Changes of in-stream nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment concentrations and loads as estimated by flow-adjusted trends of nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment. These estimates show long-term (25-year) and shorter term (10-year) changes by normalizing the annual effects of streamflow variability. The normalized estimates are based on monitoring data collected as part of the CBP nontidal water quality monitoring program.~~
- ~~■ Attainment of Chesapeake water quality standards for dissolved oxygen, chlorophyll a, water clarity/SAV standards. Attainment of these standards is based primarily on results from the CBP tidal water quality monitoring program.~~

Commented [PL33]: Scott's team to address, with input from Emily T

Commented [WM34R33]: Michelle is reaching out to Scott T, Peter T, and Emily T for updates

The WQGIT and STAR also are enhancing the monitoring and analysis to address the factors affecting annual loads, responses in living resources, and efforts underway to improve monitoring programs, including:

Water Quality Monitoring System understanding: The CBP partnership conducts annual monitoring of river flow to the Bay to help explain yearly changes in DO, clarity/SAV, and chlorophyll a conditions. Living resources monitoring is used to assess changes in populations of lower trophic levels (SAV and invertebrates) and fisheries (crabs, oysters and selected finfish species) that are dependent on habitat conditions. The CBP nontidal water quality monitoring program monitors nutrient and sediment at 1125 sites in the watershed to help document and understand the factors affecting the response to management practices. The WQGIT and STAR intend to:

- Evolves the business strategy supporting the water quality monitoring program to sustain the work that provides existing outputs and target growth opportunities. Recognizing that the tidal monitoring program operates at marginal needs for water quality standards attainment assessments (USEPA 2003), and anticipated level funding future of monitoring, further work to evolve monitoring strategies that support enhanced analysis of tidal monitoring data to assess progress toward water quality standards.
- Expand the small watershed monitoring network and assessment of data to better evaluate BMP efficiency.
- Monitor shallow groundwater to understand the effect of septic systems on water quality.
- Consider monitoring shallow groundwater to better understand contribution to surface water loads and response time between BMP implementation and water quality improvements.
- Conduct an analysis of water quality changes to better understand and explain the factors affecting water quality response to BMPs and report findings. This analysis will evaluate how nutrient and sediment transport cause lag times between implementing practices and water quality changes. This analysis will build on the USGS report on lessons learned about water quality improvements (2014 New Insights report).

Monitored Loads and Trends: The CBP partners and USGS operate the River Input Stations to monitor and help assess annual loads of nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment to the Bay which are used to explain changes in estuary water quality conditions. New techniques are being developed to improve comparison between the nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment load data collected from the monitoring stations to TMDL allocations, which were established using the modeling tools. These techniques will be implemented at additional sites in the CBP nontidal network where possible.

Commented [PT35]: Is this something we are definitely doing? I never hear about a definite groundwater monitoring program for the watershed, only sporadic studies.

Commented [PT36]: If this is a charge to the WQGIT and STAR, lets gameplan on how we formalize this. If we are formalizing it, it needs a defined home to make it happen. Thanks!

VIII. Assessing Progress

The CBP accountability framework provides the foundation to assess progress towards the Bay TMDL and associated water quality standards. The CBP partnership would be consulted on any proposed changes to the WIP Planning Targets, which provide for the watershed-wide distribution of load reductions. This is separate from any nitrogen-phosphorus and/or cross-basin exchanges within a state, which are the responsibility of that jurisdiction. Enhanced knowledge of management practices and their effects will be used primarily to refine individual jurisdiction strategies to achieve the 2017 and 2025 goals.

2017 WIP Outcome

EPA will assess the jurisdictions' progress toward reaching the Bay TMDL's ultimate nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment reduction goals at least biennially using the jurisdictions' two-year milestones commitments. Every two years, the jurisdictions are expected to identify and commit to implement specific pollutant-reduction controls and actions in each of their successive two-year milestone periods. Under the Executive Order, the federal government also has been committing to two-year milestones. EPA will measure progress towards achieving the 2017 and 2025 WIP outcomes annually by running implementation data collected from the jurisdictions through the CBP partnership's modeling tools.

While the Chesapeake Bay Partnership exceeded the 60% goals for reducing phosphorus and sediment, it fell short of the 2017 target for reducing nitrogen by 15 million pounds. The implementation of BMPs specifically in the agricultural and urban sectors will need to accelerate to close this gap. EPA will focus on the agricultural sector for Delaware and Pennsylvania; urban and suburban sector for Maryland and Pennsylvania; wastewater sector for New York; and trading and offsets for Pennsylvania.³⁰

When assessing two-year milestone commitments, EPA evaluates whether proposed actions, controls and practices would result in estimated loads at the jurisdiction scale that will put the jurisdiction on track towards meeting its 2017 and 2025 goals. EPA uses the reported BMP data and the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Model to assess the jurisdictions' progress towards meeting the target allocations. EPA also assesses the jurisdictions' and Federal Agencies' progress towards meeting its programmatic milestones (e.g., promulgation of new laws, implementation of regulations, policy development, permit issuance, compliance and enforcement commitments, etc.) at least biennially.

2025 WIP Outcome

As part of the midpoint assessment, EPA ~~will be evaluating~~evaluated the progress towards meeting the 2017 and 2025 goals established in the Bay TMDL document. The CBP partnership will use this midpoint assessment of progress to determine if the 2017 WIP outcome in this management strategy has been achieved.

This midpoint assessment not only encompasses a review of the implementation of the jurisdictions' WIPs and milestones but also water quality monitoring, modeling and decision-support tools utilized by the CBP partnership. The intent is that this assessment will strengthen and enhance the partnership's decision support capabilities used to develop the implementation plans and strategies in Phase III for meeting our shared objective in restoring the Chesapeake Bay.

Following completion of the As a result of the partnership's midpoint assessment, Phase 6 tools, enhanced decision-making tools, and analysis of trends over time, the WQGIT will no longer include workplan actions for the 2017 WIP outcome and instead we are looking to retire the 2017 WIP outcome and focus our efforts forward on the 2025 WIP outcome. To reach the 2025 WIP Outcome,

³⁰ <https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2018-07/documents/factsheet-epa-midpoint-assessment-chesapeake-bay-tmdl.pdf>

Commented [PL37]: Update based on 2017 progress and subsequent evaluation

Formatted: Body Text, Indent: Left: 0.25"

Commented [PL38]: Update based on the Phase II WIPs and future 2-year milestones

priorities for 2018-2019 include BMP verification program implementation, climate resilient BMPs, development of Phase III WIPs, monitoring trends data and explanations, technical assistance, the Conowingo WIP, and optimization system. Additionally, focuses on expanding partnership collaboration, and sharing successful approaches among partners will further strengthen our abilities to reach our shared goal of restoring the Bay²¹.

Water Quality Standards Attainment and Monitoring Outcome

The CBP partnership will evolve the business strategy to sustain the existing water quality monitoring programs. Water quality monitoring programs support data and analysis for tracking bay and watershed conditions and response to management progress. The business strategy further needs to target monitoring program enhancements to improve data coverage in space and time. Enhanced the analysis and explanation of monitoring information was a key as part of the Bay TMDL's midpoint assessment. Further science synthesis and communication product development supports tThe CBP partners continued have endorsement (PSC, May 2012) of an integrated approach that includes three primary pieces of information to measure progress toward meeting water quality standards:

- Documenting, tracking and Reporting of water quality management practices.
- Analyzing trends of nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment in the watershed.
- Assessing attainment of dissolved oxygen, chlorophyll and water clarity/SAV standards.

An integrated approach is required to quantify and explain water quality trends in the Bay and its watershed, to understand the linkages between these systems and with ecosystems and living resources, and to assess the impact and results of management actions. This approach relies on monitoring information for water quality and living resources, enhanced BMP implementation data, the use of several analytical tools (including statistical tools, CBP Watershed Model and estuary models, USGS SPARROW model and groundwater models, GAMs tidal water quality trends models), and interdisciplinary synthesis efforts. The following activities will be coordinated through the CBP STAR team and interaction with the WQGIT:

- Analyze water quality trends in the Bay and its watershed
- Develop and apply new methods for assessing and explaining change such as statistical analyses or models.
- Enhance acquisition of better spatial and temporal resolution monitoring data to fill gaps in measures necessary for assessing short duration dissolved oxygen criteria, improved resolution of chlorophyll a patterns and expand the annual coverage of water clarity acres assessments.
- Analyze and explain the factors affecting water quality trends in Bay and its watershed.
- Analyze linkages between monitored water quality in the watershed and Bay, and between water quality and living resources.
- Analyze the impact or influence of restoration and management efforts on water quality and living resources.
- Enhance CBP models using the improved understanding of trends.

Commented [PL39]: Scott and Emily to update

Commented [WM40R39]: Michelle is reaching out to Scot, Peter T, and Emily T to update

Formatted: Bullet, Space After: 0 pt

²¹ https://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/25482/v.c.-2017-2025-wip-outcomes-v1-4.25.18.pdf

- Inform management strategies to improve water quality and other outcomes. The integrated approach to quantify and explain water quality trends in the Bay and its watershed relies on monitoring information, enhanced BMP implementation data and use of several analytical tools (including statistical tools, CBP Watershed Model and estuary models, USGS SPARROW model and groundwater models). The following activities will be coordinated through the CBP STAR team and interaction with the WQGIT:
- Analyze water quality trends in the Bay and its watershed.
- Analyze and Explain the factors affecting water quality trends in Bay and its watershed.
- Enhance CBP models using the improved understanding of trends.
- Enhance acquisition of better spatial and temporal resolution monitoring data to fill gaps in measures necessary for assessing short duration dissolved oxygen criteria, improved resolution of chlorophyll a patterns and expand the annual coverage of water clarity acres assessments.
- Inform management strategies to improve water quality.

IX. Adaptively Managing

The Partnership will use the following approaches to ensure adaptive management:

In a dynamic environment like the Bay watershed, changes during the next 15 years are inevitable. It may be possible to accommodate those changes within the existing Bay TMDL framework without the need to revise it in whole, or in part. The CBP partnership has committed to take an adaptive management approach to the Bay TMDL and incorporate new scientific understandings into the implementation planning in two-year milestones and in Phase III following the midpoint assessment. Future adjustments to WIPs and two-year milestones based on changing conditions and the availability of new information is consistent with the CBP's concept of adaptive management.

The CBP partnership will continue to examine the following questions to address implementation challenges and opportunities, incorporate new data and scientific understandings and refine decision support tools and management strategies toward the achievement of the water quality outcomes in the 2014 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement:

- What progress had been made in implementing practices for the Bay TMDL?
- What are the changes in water quality and progress toward applicable water quality standards?
- What are we learning about the factors affecting water quality changes to better implement practices?
- What refinements are needed in decision support tools, monitoring and science?
- How do we make program decisions in a business strategy that sustains and grows monitoring programs to meet ongoing and growing CBP information needs under recognized economic constraints?
- How do we best consider the combined impacts of land change and climate variability (storm events and long-term change) on nutrient and sediment loading and implications for the Bay TMDL?

Commented [PL41]: Any new questions to address or that can be removed from this list? Financing or implementation related?

Commented [WM42R41]: Michelle will reach out to WQGIT members for feedback and updates

- What Partnership actions can be taken to refine and simplify BMP verification protocols, and what support can the Partnership provide to jurisdictions in addressing BMP verification and reporting needs?
-

X. Biennial Workplan

Biennial workplans for the 2025 WIP outcome and the Water Quality Standards Attainment and Monitoring Outcome will be developed by December 2018. -each management strategy will be developed by April 2016. It will include the following information:

- Each key action
- Timeline for the action
- Expected outcome
- Partners responsible for each action
- Estimated resources

In 2008, the Chesapeake Executive Council charged the seven Bay watershed jurisdictions to develop a two-year milestone process for reducing their respective nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment contributions to the Chesapeake Bay and to track the pace of those reductions. Two-year milestones are short-term objectives under the Bay TMDL accountability framework used to assess progress towards restoration goals while allowing jurisdictions to flexibly adapt their WIPs to meet those goals. The Bay jurisdictions' two-year milestones and EPA's evaluations of these commitments and assessment of progress can be accessed here:

<http://www.epa.gov/reg3wapd/tmdl/ChesapeakeBay/RestorationUnderway.html>.

The two-year milestones will be addressed in the biennial workplan, together with Partnership-identified actions intended to advance understanding, programmatic and implementation support in the Bay jurisdictions' progress towards implementing the Phase III WIPs by 2025 will be included in the biennial workplan. The two-year milestones will serve as the biennial workplan for this management strategy as they represent key check-in points on the way to having all pollution reduction measures in place by 2025 to restore the Bay and its tidal waters, with controls in place by 2017 that would achieve 60 percent of the necessary reductions. The Bay jurisdictions' two-year milestones and EPA's evaluations of these commitments and assessment of progress can be accessed here:

<http://www.epa.gov/reg3wapd/tmdl/ChesapeakeBay/RestorationUnderway.html>. This management strategy will be updated as these evaluations occur.

Key Priorities for Inclusion in the Biennial Workplan

- Developing understanding of BMP performance, siting and design under climate change conditions
- Optimization system and BMP co-benefits
- Development of the Phase III WIPs
- Technical Assistance & Funding to the Bay jurisdictions in Phase III WIP implementation
- Development and Implementation of the Conowingo WIP
- Implementation of BMP verification program

Commented [WM43]: Suggested text in response to Nicki Kasi's comment: BMP verification has to be in this mix somewhere.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", No bullets or focus

Commented [PL44]: Update based on new materials and focus

Commented [WM45R44]: Moving away from milestones-only approach, towards technical assistance (tech assistance and funding, optimization tools, WIP development), adapting to new conditions (Climate change, Conowingo), and expanding understanding of management actions (BMP co-benefits, climate-smart BMPs)

Commented [PT46]: New date for this work plan?

Commented [WM47]: Deleting 2018-2020 workplan priorities to allow more general approach in strategy and avoid need for strategy updates in 2020

Formatted: Body Text

Chesapeake Bay Management Strategy
2017 WIP, 2025 WIP and Water Quality Standards Attainment
& Monitoring Outcomes

- ~~Business plan development for sustaining, and identifying and adopting opportunities for growing an increasingly integrated monitoring program~~
- ~~Explaining trends in monitoring data~~

Commented [PT48]: Suggested addition for the new 2-yr planning period.

Formatted: Bullet

The Bay jurisdictions' 2014-2015 milestones are expected to reduce phosphorus by nearly 2.4 million pounds and decrease sediment by more than 1.1 billion pounds by the end of 2015, compared to the 2009 baseline. The jurisdictions' 2014-2015 milestones are expected to reduce nitrogen by nearly 25 million pounds, but an additional reduction of nearly 6 million pounds is needed to remain on track to meet the 2017 target³².

~~The Bay jurisdictions' two-year milestones and EPA's evaluations of these commitments and assessment of progress can be accessed here:
<http://www.epa.gov/reg3wapa/tmdl/ChesapeakeBay/RestorationUnderway.html>. This management strategy will be updated as these evaluations occur.~~

³² http://stat.chesapeakebay.net/?q=node/130&quicktabs_10=3