Maryland’s Phase 3 WIP Inventory

To guide discussion with each county’s public works staff

1. What are your jurisdiction’s primary interests when it comes to management of surface waters and groundwater?
2. How can we best align your jurisdiction’s interests with meeting goals that are established by the Chesapeake Bay TMDL?
3. How have you perceived the process of establishing WIP goals for local jurisdictions in the past? Was there too much involvement from the State? Not enough? Do you have suggestions to help improve the process?
4. MDE plans to take the lead on the Statewide Phase III WIP process and is engaging jurisdictions to help produce local WIP Inventories of practices and programs that will be incorporated into statewide strategy.
5. We are interested in helping to make this process as efficient and inclusive as possible for you. Does having MDE playing a primary role in Phase III WIP development create an obstacle to your jurisdiction’s approach to meeting Bay TMDL goals?
6. Have you discussed sharing credit with the Ag community in your jurisdiction?
7. We don’t think we have a complete inventory of municipalities’ practices within your county. Are you aware of activities of municipalities within your county, specifically related to nutrient and sediment reductions? In what way do you collect information on practices from municipalities within your county?
8. If you received any State, or other grant funding, to implement restoration projects, please let us know so that we can give you proper credit for that work.
9. Is the local milestone process helpful to your jurisdiction? How can we make the milestone process more useful? Easier?
10. What factors limit your jurisdiction’s ability to implement more practices to reduce nutrient loading to the Bay? Examples include funding, staff, local priorities, state or local policies, etc.
11. What additional tools, resources and/or partners are needed to facilitate current implementation efforts? Increase capacity to implement more practices?
12. MD’s water quality trading regulations became final in July. Do you believe your jurisdiction will participate in nutrient trading? Why or why not?
13. What other projects is your jurisdiction implementing that might help reduce nutrient loading to the Bay as a co-benefit? Examples include transportation, recreation, public health, flooding, infrastructure improvement, climate resiliency, etc.
14. (For non-MS4s only) How would your jurisdiction prefer local WIP goals or targets to be expressed? Examples include pounds, number of projects, percent reduction, etc.
15. (For non-MS4s only) How would your jurisdiction prefer to report practices implemented? Examples include spreadsheets, geodatabases, etc.
16. What else would you like for us to know? Any other suggestions?
17. Do you anticipate preserving any farmland through land preservation programs for the 2018-2025 time period that are solely funded by your local government? Forest land?
18. Targeting new growth on existing developed lands can leverage private and public partnerships. What is your jurisdiction’s preference in terms of redevelopment of urban areas v. growth on natural or agricultural lands? Are there incentives that you think would help drive redevelopment of urban areas? Have you heard concerns from your development community?