Chesapeake Bay Program (CBP) partnership Milestone Workgroup's recommendation to the Water Quality Goal Implementation Team (WQGIT) for consideration: Elimination of CBP partnership's two-year water quality numeric milestones under the Chesapeake Bay Total Maximum Daily Load Accountability

Framework

## Pros Cons Not a significant driver for state planning No short-term accountability or commitment to demonstrate remaining on Annual progress evaluation is a better data pace to achieve the 2025 goals source for planning for the next 2-year Not consistent with the 2008 Executive cycle Council commitment • Most states do not control what Best Management Practices (BMPs) are Not consistent with the current WQGIT installed. However, smaller states have Management Strategy which anticipates both numeric and programmatic 2-year more control. milestone development. Local entities (e.g., counties or private property owners) ultimately decide which May not be consistent with the Federal BMPs are installed. Therefore, states can Executive Order (EO) Strategy. However, EO strategy does not specify a only make an estimate of what the counties will do. Local entities are not commitment for numeric milestones, only required to develop 2-year plans. "milestones". Therefore, having programmatic milestones will meet their Because states have no control over what commitments. is implemented, sometimes this effort becomes a paperwork exercise to meet a Two-year numeric commitments allow flexibility in proposing short-term target. changes in implementation since states States have other internal mechanisms for may not expect progress to be even yearsetting goals (e.g., MD has a financial assurance planning program for their to-year. MS4s). Will not impact ability to get

- Decision on numeric milestones to address climate change reductions post-2022 will be discussed separately
- Decision on numeric milestones for Conowingo will be handled separately

commitments from federal agencies