

Virginia Phase III Local Engagement

Chesapeake Bay
Stakeholder Advisory
Committee Meeting
12-8-16

Joan Salvati
Manager, Local Government
Assistance Programs



Proposed Local Engagement Plan

1. Meet with stakeholder associations on engagement approach – Receive ongoing input from Stakeholder Advisory Group
2. Initial outreach to elected officials and local staff – includes soil & water conservation districts
3. Second round of outreach events including more detail on expectations, timelines and the status of the model
4. Regional work sessions between DEQ, other state agencies, local entities and stakeholders – will include assistance with strategy development
5. Ongoing assistance to localities and/or soil & water conservation districts

Initial Presentation Content

- Information on the Bay TMDL and the two previous WIPs
- Recent indicators of the Bay's improving water quality
- Benefits of progress made (Blue Crab populations; Bay grasses)
- Update on changes to the Bay Model, particularly the land use information
- Status of various partnership initiatives and progress (SL6; milestones; waste water treatment plant upgrades)
- Examples of local success stories
- Elicit comments on the Phase III outreach & planning

Outreach Schedule

- **June through December 2016:** Meetings with local government organizations including VACo, Assoc. of PDCs, Assoc. of SWCDs, VML, VMA, VMWA, VAMSA
- **January 2017**
 - **Northern Area:** Staff level meeting first, followed by elected official meeting
 - **Valley area:** before Staff level meeting first, followed by elected official meeting
- **February 2017**
 - **Central area**
- **March 2017**
 - **Hampton Roads and Eastern Shore areas**
- **April 2017**
 - **Lynchburg area**

Local Area Targets Task Force

- December 2015 WQGIT Face to Face Meeting:
 - ACTION: “... convene an ad-hoc Task Force with cross-sector representation that will frame out the options for a WQGIT recommendation regarding the development of local area targets for the Phase III WIPs.”
- 32 Members
 - All Six States and the District of Columbia
 - 2 Federal
 - 8 State
 - 2 Conservation Districts
 - 6 NGOs
 - 2 Local Government Elected Officials; 7 Local Staff; 5 Local Associations

Water Quality GIT Charge

“...make recommendations to the Water Quality Goal Implementation Team (WQGIT) regarding whether the Phase III WIPs should include local area planning targets (LAPTs) and, if so, options for how these targets could be expressed in different jurisdictions.....”

Charge poses 3 questions:

- 1. Should local area planning goals be established?**
- 2. How should “Local” or scale be defined?**
- 3. How should local area planning goals be expressed?**

Recommendations – Question #1

Should Local Area Planning Goals Be Established?

- Initial recommendation: Determination of whether or not to establish local goals is best made by the 7 Bay jurisdictions
- Task Force recognizes the intent of Water Quality GIT that local planning goals *should* be established by each of the seven Chesapeake Bay jurisdictions at a scale below the state-major river basin
- The Task Force recommends that the jurisdictions have flexibility as to the scale of the local goals and how they should be expressed working with their local and regional partners, stakeholders and federal and state facilities

Recommendations – Question #2

How Should “Local” or Scale Be Defined?

- Locality jurisdictional boundaries or collections of such sub-state political subdivisions
- Federal facilities
- State facilities
- Soil & Water Conservation District (Conservation District) boundaries
- Regional entity boundaries (i.e. planning district commissions; regional river basin commissions, utility districts)
- Watershed or sub-watersheds of Chesapeake Bay Tributaries
- Targeted areas with high nitrogen, phosphorus or sediment yields (loadings)
- “Segment-sheds” as depicted in the 2010 TMDL
- Any area (e.g. MS4), entity or political subdivision based on an identified need for pollutant reductions for a given source sector or sectors
- Some combination of the above

Recommendations – Question #3

How Should Local Area Planning Goals Be Expressed?

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

Next Steps

- Finalize document based on 12/6/16 Task Force conference call
- Present recommendations to Principal Staff Committee on 12/13/16
- Present Final Recommendations to Water Quality GIT on 12/19/16

Questions & Discussion

