

Closing Panel

Moderator: Tom Simpson

Urban Stormwater: Norm Goulet

Agriculture: Russ Perkinson

Policy and Market Based Programs: Ron Korczak

Norm Goulet

- As was mentioned earlier by Kelly Shenk, we need to keep the model in context. It is a planning tool. However, many people on the urban side think that this context is getting lost since the model is going to be used as a regulatory tool to determine whether an urban jurisdiction is meeting some type of water quality goal.
- None of the efficiencies are set in stone. They can be revised as additional information becomes available.
- Some of the earlier efficiency estimates were likely very rosy. The revised efficiencies tend to be lower than the prior efficiencies.
- The urban sector is moving towards treatment trains and effluent guidelines.
- We can't just do the bean counting anymore. We need to look at more of a treatment train process. They are trying to push the Chesapeake Bay Program and the model to looking at this from more of a systems standpoint.
- There are, however, some concerns with a systems approach. For example, when homeowner #2 or #3 comes in, they may not understand that certain components of their home/yard are part of a system.
- Things such as Low Impact Development (LID) essentially use a systems approach.
- To a certain extent, the development community is still a barrier.
- There will be some impact with development. The key is to develop in a way that is the least damaging and has the least impact.

Russ Perkinson

- The revised efficiencies for agricultural BMPs also tend to be lower than the previous efficiencies.
- Those in the agricultural sector want to believe that their efforts are meaningful.
- Funding in the future could be affected by how the efficiencies rank.
- If the efficiencies are over-inflated, however, then there are several negative outcomes that could occur:
 - The general public will wonder why water quality is not improving despite the effort that is being made.
 - Our ability to achieve the water quality standards in the TMDL may be affected.
 - We may be asking certain sectors to do more than what is possible.
- It is important to look at what can be achieved as we move into the Bay TMDL. Each sector may not be able to achieve the same level of reduction.
- It is useful to target the BMPs that are the most cost-effective.

- States are looking more at nutrient credit trading programs that involve baseline levels of implementation.
- BMP efficiencies are useful for targeting.
- Barriers to implementation for agricultural producers include resistance to change and economics (short term and long term). There are social issues as well. Producers do not want their field to 'look bad' or be too 'weedy' as a result of no-till.
- Some practices, such as no-till, are eventually self-sustaining and economically beneficial in the long-run. In contrast, some practices, such as cover crops, have an annual cost.
- Having tiered practices for different levels of implementation is a good idea, even though it does make tracking more difficult.

Ron Korczak

- There are five elements that are necessary, or at least extremely useful, for moving forward with policy/regulatory issues and market based programs. These are:
 - BMP definition that is operational and can be implemented
 - Estimated expected impact
 - Cost-benefit
 - Verification (Need to verify what we think is happening has actually happened)
 - Follow-up monitoring
- Corporations are going to be expected to produce food with minimal environmental impacts as a result of a push from consumers. Corporate responsibility is going to be a driver in the future.