Menu of Options			
Option	**Description**	**Implementation Considerations**	**Pros/Cons/Technical Considerations**
#2: Factor Climate Change into Phase III WIP' Base Conditions	Use either the 2025 or 2050 climate projection scenarios as base conditions (informed by CBWM climate modeling results) in the establishment of the jurisdictions' Phase III WIPs. The climate change projection would be an added load that the jurisdictions would need to address in addition to their Phase III WIP planning targets, thereby increasing the level of effort.	Addressing climate change as part of the base conditions does not change the assimilative capacity of CB, nor the Phase III WIP planning targets. The decision to select this option will require consideration of the results and level of confidence in existing climate modeling runs. The partnership will have modeling output results now, but there will be uncertainty and projections may change over time.	*Pro:* Comprehensive approach; quantitative analysis and response. *Con:* This option would increase the level of effort required to meet water quality standards. To offset anticipated changes in loads due to climate change, a greater level of effort (i.e., BMP implementation) will be needed. *Technical Feasibility:* High in near-term. The decision support tools exist to implement this option in sequence with other decisions related to the development of the Phase III WIP planning targets.
#5: Factor Climate Change into Phase III WIP BMP Optimization.	During the development of Phase III WIPs, jurisdictions' would prioritize the selection of BMPs that will better mitigate the anticipated increased nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment loads due to the projected effects of climate change through 2025 or 2050.	Additional research would be needed to support full implementation of this option over time. Implementation of this option would require engagement with source sector workgroups involved with BMP expert panels to determine whether there is a sound scientific understanding and the technical capacity assess the likely impact of climate change on BMP efficiencies over time.	*Pro:* Ensures selection of BMPs in the Phase III WIP would include consideration of projected climate change conditions. This would help the jurisdictions optimize their reductions from nonpoint source BMPs over the long term, since the effectiveness of some BMPs could be more susceptible than others due to changes in climate. *Con:* Lack of technical understanding of the response of almost all CBP partnership approved BMPs to changes in hydrologic and meteorological conditions. *Technical Feasibility:* Near-term technical feasibility to support full implementation of this option is low.
#6: Adaptively Manage Phase III WIP BMP Implementation (Post Phase III WIP development).	During each two-year milestone development period, jurisdictions would consider new information on the performance of existing BMPs, including the contribution of seasonal, inter-annual climate variability and weather extremes on BMP performance. When there is a detectable impact on the effectiveness of a BMP performance, jurisdictions would use this information	This option would not affect the development of Phase III WIPs, but would come into play during each two-year milestone period. To inform implementation, the WQGIT and source sector workgroups would need to work together to assess how the jurisdictions, BMP expert panels, and the partnership in general	*Pro:* This option would enable the partnership to learn more about BMP performance and the sensitivity of BMPs that are attributable to climate change, to allow for consideration of these factors while adaptively managing for long-term change. *Con:* Implementing this option as a stand-alone would put off making any substantive or quantitative approach to addressing climate change in the near-term. This option would require additional monitoring and assessment efforts.

	to re-prioritize the selection of BMPs to implement in the Phase III WIPs that will better mitigate the anticipated increased in nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment loads.	could facilitate the collection and evaluation of BMP performance data.	*Technical Feasibility:* Near-term technical feasibility to support full implementation of this option is low.
#7: Factor Climate Change into Programmatic Commitments with Set Expectations.	The projected impacts of climate change in 2025 and 2050 will be assessed and relayed to the jurisdictions. Jurisdictions would provide a narrative that describes their programmatic commitments to address climate change in their Phase III WIPs. Jurisdictions are expected to consult the Guiding Principles when developing their narratives. Narratives may vary among jurisdictions, but would include a description of their method(s) for gathering and assessing scientific data and information, their conclusions based on that information, and how those conclusions guide their programmatic commitments.	This option is qualitative in nature but would encourage jurisdictions to use local expertise and knowledge along with the latest climate information and science to inform their programmatic commitments. Commitments will vary across jurisdictions but could include activities such as: undertaking demonstration projects, prioritizing implementation of climate-smart programs and BMPs; approaches for assessing vulnerability of planned BMPs; or enhancing plans, policies, regulations or on-the-ground efforts to address impacts, etc.	*Pro:* This option allows for flexibility in jurisdictions' approaches to addressing climate change, and can incorporate local knowledge and information where quantitative data may be lacking. It also provides standard elements to be addressed across narratives to provide for accountability and consistency across proposed narratives. *Con:* Options that rely on quantitative information may provide for learning across jurisdictions about methods and results that work well for addressing projected climate changes. While the programmatic commitment option is more flexible than other quantitative options, methods and results are highly individual and are therefore not likely to lead to information that is replicable across jurisdictions. Providing an option for programmatic commitments may also cause some jurisdictions to avoid using quantitative approaches when they are technically able to do so to address climate change. *Technical Feasibility:* Medium in near-term.