

Summary of Survey 2 and Path Forward

WQGIT Revised CAST21 Recommendations to MB

May 23, 2022



Consensus Continuum



Survey 2 results overview

Consensus Continuum Results	<u>Recommendation 1</u> The Management Board should discuss and develop balanced expectations to assess progress and measure success in meeting the 2025 water quality goals when data updates significantly increase the level of effort (e.g., to address growth and climate change) for the partnership between now and 2025.	<u>Recommendation 2</u> The Management Board should affirm the CBP partnership's commitment to evaluate fertilizer data sources and associated methods to improve partners' confidence in both inputs and modeled results.	<u>Recommendation 3</u> The Management Board should encourage the CBP partnership to update or clarify policies and procedures, including schedules and steps to resolve data errors or concerns if they arise during future CAST updates between now and 2025, and beyond.	
	Endorse	5	4	5
	Agree w/ Reservations	2	3	1
	Stand Aside	0	0	2
	Hold	2	3	2
	Stop	1	0	0

Recommendation 1

Holds (2)

- I disagree with this approach because accounting for growth has always been a part of the partnership commitment, the fact that we under anticipated that level of growth, does not imply we should not attempt to address that growth even if it brings great challenges to our currently proposed plan.
- The recommendation should be more direct and be combined with #3 to develop a plan. "As we approach 2025, the Management Board should direct the WQGIT to identify policies, procedures, and schedules for multiple lines of evidence to assess 2025, including policies to address unanticipated load increases (or decreases) with future CAST iterations."
 - I request removing the word 'growth' in this context. If the context is 'urban growth', then it is factored into 2025 and the Phase III WIPs through the Land Use Change Model (LUCM). There wasn't any indication that growth was a factor in influencing load differences between CAST19 and CAST21. The land use change product that was incorporated into CAST21 had minimal impact in terms of actual acreage changes, and therefore loads. If "growth" is referring to the change in the crop yield numbers or fertilizer, then the phrase should be changed to reflect that or the specific phrase intended.
 - I do agree that ideas to consider should include a review of multiple lines of evidence towards evaluating 2025 and a narrative approach to addressing unexpected increases in loads.

Stop (1)

- Unreliable load estimates should not be used to alter our good progress and strategies at this stage. Keep the focus on implementation and evaluate progress with the Phase 7 model tools. There should not be any expectation to alter course at this stage.

Recommendation 2

Holds (3)

- The implications of the data as it has evolved concurrently with the model-without adaptive management-does not represent reality and this solution is inadequate.
- We must consider the load effects in order to judge whether the changes being predicted represent on the ground change or if they are illogical to determine if something needs to be fixed prior to the update. The idea that the Bay partnership's earlier decisions re: how AAPFCO is used overrides a result that is illogical is not supported by WV. Until we have identified a remedy (Jeff Sweeney's smoothing or some other), WV does not support using the AAPFCO data for urban fertilizer projections.
- This recommendation in my view is the most important, and yet the language provided here provides little specific guidance on how exactly this can happen. If our current approach to tracking fertilizer is problematic, we should guide the management board on how they might fix, specifically outlining what is needed. Should the partnership invest in new data sources? What process can be established to address? "affirm the CBP partnership's commitment to evaluate fertilizer data sources and associated methods" is not specific enough to expect a resolution.

Recommendation 3

Holds (2)

- "This should be combined with #1, ""As we approach 2025, the Management Board should direct the WQGIT to identify policies, procedures, and schedules for multiple lines of evidence to assess 2025, including policies to address unanticipated load increases (or decreases) with future CAST iterations."" This may help instill trust and confidence in the data and path forward to evaluate 2025. Based on the experience with CAST21, that confidence isn't there. For what it's worth, the WQGIT should already have the power to do all these recommendations. If the WQGIT doesn't have the authority to do this, then let's make the ask specific so a path forward can be charted."
- Overall, I agree. My primary reservation is that the process/procedures should also consider an approval process that I do not believe exists today. The level at which the approval is done (e.g. PSC, MB) can be discussed, but buy-in and support of partners seems important, especially given the nature and problems associated with the CAST 21 release.

Recommendation 1: Path forward?

- Current language:
 - The Management Board should discuss and develop balanced expectations to assess progress and measure success in meeting the 2025 water quality goals when data updates significantly increase the level of effort (e.g., to address growth and climate change) for the partnership between now and 2025.
- Alternate language:
 - The Management Board should discuss and encourage the PSC to clarify what to do with the additional nitrogen load associated with the CAST 21 update and consider how the update and future updates affect assessing progress and measuring success in meeting the 2025 water quality goals.

See also Rec. 3: combine?

Recommendation 2: Path forward?

- No consensus, no defined alternate language or proposal at this time.
- Urban and Ag Workgroups already formulating plans to address AAPFCO concerns.

Recommendation 3: Path forward?

- Combine with Rec. 1?
- After discussion, do we have proposed alternate language?

Path forward

- Work with Ed on the side (via chat)
- After today, if no consensus among attending members, recommendations will not be further amended
- Lack of consensus will be documented and shared as part of briefing to MB on June 9