Scenario	Attributes						
	Geography	BMPs	Total N Reduction (lbs/year)	Total Annualized Cost ($/Year)/ Cost Effectiveness ($/lbs)	Description & Notes	Fatal Flaws	SC Vote
1	Conowingo Shell > All counties in PA & MD > Drains to Chesapeake Bay > Excluded Phase I jurisdictions*	Agricultural + Urban	6.0 Million	$369 Million/$61	This is the only scenario that is aggregated by county; everything else is by land-river segment (LRS). This scenario uses the WIP3 baseline. Mike Hickman (CWP)		CBC: DC: DE: MD: NY: PA: VA: WV:
2	Susquehanna watershed > Added Q1 N-effective[1] LRS outside of the Susquehanna	Agricultural + Urban	6.1 Million	$236 Million/$39	Deb Caraco (CWP)		CBC: DC: DE: MD: NY: PA: VA: WV:
3	Only Q1 N-Effective[2] LRS within Bay Watershed	Agricultural	6.4 Million	$51 Million/$8	Jeff Sweeney (EPA CBP)		CBC: DC: DE: MD: NY: PA: VA: WV:
4	Only Q2 N-effective LRS	Agricultural	6.6 Million	$51 Million/$8		Jeff Sweeney	CBC: DC:

	within the Susquehanna watershed[3]					(EPA CBP)	DE: MD: NY: PA: VA: WV:
5	Only Q2 N-effective LRS within the Susquehanna watershed	Agricultural + Urban	6.6 Million	$51 Million/$8	The BMPs in this scenario are the same as Scenario 4, but it also includes urban forestry and urban buffer practices.	Deb Caraco (CWP)	CBC: DC: DE: MD: NY: PA: VA: WV:
6	Conowingo Shell	Agricultural +Urban	6.2 Million	$124 Million/$20	Cost-Effective Ag Practices plus Urban Forestry and Bioswales Deb Caraco (CWP)		CBC: DC: DE: MD: NY: PA: VA: WV:
6.1	Conowingo Shell	Agricultural + Urban	6.2 Million	$90 Million/$14	This is a modification to Scenario 6 that incorporates BMP implementation levels and Urban BMPS (bioswale and infiltration) consistent with other Final scenarios. Deb Caraco (CWP)		CBC: DC: DE: MD: NY: PA: VA: WV:
7	Conowingo Shell	Agricultural	6.0 Million	$65 Million/$11	Same as Scenario 6.1 but without urban BMPs Deb Caraco (CWP)		CBC: DC: DE:

						MD: NY: PA: VA: WV:
8	Only Q2 N-effective LRS within the Conowingo Shell	Agricultural + Urban	6.3 Million	$96 Million/$15	Uses the same BMPs as Scenario 6.1 but focuses on the upper quartile LRSs. Uses modified WIP3 Baseline. Jeff Sweeney (EPA CBP)		CBC: DC: DE: MD: NY: PA: VA: WV:
9	Only Q2 N-effective LRS within the Conowingo Shell	Agricultural	6.0 Million	$50 Million/$8	Same BMPs as Scenario 8, but without urban BMPs Jeff Sweeney (EPA CBP)		CBC: DC: DE: MD: NY: PA: VA: WV:
10	Susquehanna watershed > Added Q1 N-effective[1] Bay-Wide LRS outside of the Susquehanna	Agricultural + Urban	6.2 Million	$135 Million/$22	Same BMPs as Scenarios 7 and 9 Deb Caraco (CWP)		CBC: DC: DE: MD: NY: PA: VA: WV:
11	Susquehanna watershed > Added Q1 N-effective[1] Bay-	Agricultural	6.1 Million	$120 Million/$20	Same as Scenario 10 but without Urban BMPs Deb Caraco (CWP)		CBC: DC: DE: MD:

	Wide LRS outside of the Susquehanna					NY: PA: VA: WV:

* If a county drains to the Chesapeake Bay and is partially within the Conowingo shell, then the whole county was included in the scenario output. Then, Phase I jurisdictions were removed (already heavily regulated and in less effective areas).

[1]Q1 Nitrogen (N)-Effective: Most effective land-river segments (LRS) for nitrogen reduction delineated by the upper quartile.

[2]Q2 Nitrogen (N)-Effective: Most effective land-river segments (LRS) for nitrogen reduction delineated by the median.

[3]This scenario uses 1995 CAST data.

Red Font Indicates Scenarios recommended to present to the PSC. Includes three geographies and Urban/Ag or Ag BMP options.