



Conowingo WIP



Chesapeake Bay Commission
January 3, 2019

Objectives

- How We Got Here
- Accomplishments so far
 - Composition of Steering Committee
 - Guiding Principles – Overall Charge and Goals
- How is the CWIP the Same/Different from State WIPs?
- Report Outline and CWIP Content

How We Got Here

- 1996-2008 USGS Bathymetry and Sediment-Storage Studies in Susquehanna Reservoirs
- 2010 Bay TMDL (Appendix T) Recognized WQS impacts from Conowingo Infill must be addressed & states should work together
- 2015 LSRWA concluded the Conowingo reservoir is full and impairing WQS
- 2017-2018 Mid-Point Assessment & Phase 6 Model Analysis quantified nutrient loads from Conowingo infill

Collaborating to Identify Solutions

In Dec. 2017 the PSC agreed to the following collaborative approach given the magnitude of the problem and unknowns regarding the outcome of the water quality certification process:

- Establish a separate Conowingo Planning Target based on the additional N and P reductions that are needed as a result of the Conowingo Dam infill and collectively develop a separate Conowingo WIP (CWIP);
- Pool resources across Jurisdictions for placing BMPs in the most effective areas, which reduces overall costs and increases BMP efficiency;
- Develop a financing strategy to implement the CWIP that considers innovative funding approaches, leverages public, private, other funding sources; and,
- Establish a Steering Committee and hire a 3rd Party contractor to assist with CWIP development and implementation.

Steering Committee --

- Created by the Principals' Staff Committee
 - Comprised of representatives of the Jurisdictions
 - DC – Katherine Antos
 - DE – Marcia Fox, Brittany Sturgis
 - MD – Matthew Rowe, Dave Goshorn
 - NY – Ken Kosinski and Lauren Townley
 - PA – Nicki Kasi
 - VA – Ann Jennings
 - WV – Teresa Koon
 - Chesapeake Bay Commission – Mark Hoffman, Ann Swanson (Alternate)
 - EPA has an oversight role
- Co-chairs: Matt Rowe, Maryland; Nicki Kasi, Pennsylvania
- Function as an Action Team in terms of Governance

Framework – Separate Phase 3 WIP

- Address 6 million pounds of nitrogen; 260,000 lbs of phosphorus
- Four Options for reductions
 - Susquehanna Only (6.01 million pounds nitrogen)
 - Susquehanna + Most Effective Basins (6.12 million pounds nitrogen)
 - Susquehanna Basin + All of Maryland and Virginia (7.21 million pounds nitrogen)
 - Then Entire Chesapeake Bay Watershed (7.28 million pounds nitrogen)
- Innovative and Collaborative Financing Strategy
- Defined roles for:
 - EPA – Oversight & Evaluation
 - Steering Committee
 - TetraTech – Contractor Support Until RFA Released for 3rd Party
 - A 3rd Party
 - Select through a Request for Application Process
 - Development of a Financing Strategy for the Phase 3 WIP
 - Phase 3 WIP Implementation
 - Track/verify progress
 - Pursue additional funding sources
 - PSC
 - Approve final draft Phase 3 WIP before posting
 - Review progress of the Steering Committee

Guiding Principles (Paraphrased)

- Strive for fairness, equity and feasibility among partners regarding level of effort, financing, tracking, resource sharing and 3rd party access
- Strive for consensus using Partnership Consensus Continuum
- Ensure consistency with EPA Expectations and Conowingo WIP Framework Documents
- Establish clear tracking, accountability and verification consistent with expectations for jurisdictions and transparently demonstrate planned, implemented and maintained practices to avoid double counting
- Implement the WIP building on existing, successful programs as much as feasible to avoid duplicative bureaucracy. Strive for innovation, leverage new technology, and new approaches where appropriate.

Formalizing Collaboration

- June 19 and October 26, 2018 - EPA Issued Phase III WIP Expectations and a memo, respectively, that memorialized PSC decisions on Conowingo Dam; and,
- December 7, 2018 – EPA grant allocation memo that officially pooled a portion of jurisdiction Chesapeake Bay grant funding with EPA funding to support the CWIP effort (\$500K annually).

Report Outline

- Local, Regional and Federal Engagement
 - Communications Office/Workgroup
- Program/Project Targeting
 - Contractor Support
- Programmatic and Numeric Implementation Commitments
- Financing Strategy
 - 3rd Party (RFA)
- Accountability, Tracking and Crediting
 - Contractor Support
- Milestones and Progress Reporting
- Timeline and Next Steps
 - To Be Determined

Questions to Answer

- What is the most effective *combination* of voluntary, regulatory, incentive, legislative and funding actions necessary to achieve the nutrient reductions? Where?
- How is the CWIP going to be funded long-term?
- How do we track, account for and credit CWIP practices and accomplishments?
- What are the states already doing that needs to be kept separate because they are part of the state's WIP or that can be counted toward the CWIP?
- How do we engage local partners and ensure clear messaging around the CWIP?

Matt Rowe

matthew.rowe@maryland.gov

410-537-3578

Veronica Kasi

vbkasi@pa.gov

717-772-4053

www.chesapeakebay.net

www.epa.gov/chesapeakebaytmdl



Chesapeake Bay Program
Science. Restoration. Partnership.