Market Solutions and Restoring the Chesapeake

> *The Economics of Nutrient Trading*

> > Jack E. Frye Virginia Director Chesapeake Bay Commission

> > > September 2012



Tri-State Legislative Commission

• PA, MD, VA

Legislative Partner of Chesapeake Bay Program

- 7 Members Each (21 total)
- 2 Senate
- 3 House
- Governor or Designee
 - Citizen At-Large

32 years of *Policy for the Bay*



The Chesapeake Bay is impaired and subject to a federally imposed TMDL.

Nutrient Trading is One Possible Solution

In our region, 4 states have nutrient trading programs

Pennsylvania Maryland Virginia *West Virginia*



Project Development & Funding



Economics Analysis, Modeling and Report Preparation



Project Management, Policy & Technical Expertise

> **HOPE** IMPACTS Hoagland Outcomes for the Preservation of our Environment

Transparency, Accuracy & Applicability

ECONOMICS OF TRADING ADVISORY COUNCIL

Is:

of the Stud

To investigate the *POTENTIAL* cost savings

To estimate how potential savings are affected by differing sources and scope

Is NOT:

X To model specific state programs

To predict future trading levels

Summary of Findings

Potential Cost Savings (%) from Nutrient Credit Trading

Savings expressed as a percent of TMDL compliance costs for significant point sources with no trading, except for the last column, where the savings are expressed as the percent of TMDL compliance costs for significant point sources and urban stormwater sources *combined*.

Potential Cost Savings (%) from Trading to Offset New Loads

Savings expressed as a percent of costs due to additional treatment capacity at wastewater treatment plants. Does not include costs from land use changes.





Increasing Geographic Scope

Why POTENTIAL Cost Savings? en filli

<u>A MARKET Requires</u> Defined Product Buyer Seller Voluntary Entry A MARKETPLACE Requires

Rules and Boundaries
Information
Access

In Reality MARKETS DO NOT WORK PERFECTLY

Policymakers must consider factors other than cost

Market Restrictions

Baseline for Agriculture

TMDL implementation

Baseline for Significant Point Sources TMDL WLA or 2010 load

Protection of Local Water Quality Trades limited to 9M lbs.. N; 200,000 lbs.. P

Trading Ratio 2:1

Transaction Costs 38%

Maintain Productive Farmland

maximum 25% retirement



Geography



t Trading

S

Nutrient

ろ <u>en</u> Nutri

Sources

3 <u>short term scenarios</u> SigPS-Only SigPS-AgrNPS SigPS-AgrNPS-Urban

long term scenario

Offset-Only

Significant Point Sources (SigPS)

475 municipal and industrial facilities

- 16 tiers of treatment based on:
 - 8,5 or 3 mg/L N
 - 1,0.5 or 0.1 mg/L P
- Annualized costs (capital and O&M) based on EPA's ongoing cost analysis

Jane Thomas, ian.umces.edu/imagelibrary

<u>Agricultural and</u> <u>Urban Stormwater BMPs</u>

- Annualized unit costs (\$/ac/yr)
- Includes land, installation and O&M

F



The Chesapeake Bay Program's *Watershed Model Phase 5.3.2* Provided Key Inputs

- Watershed network and segmentation
- Land use/land cover
- Delivered loads
- BMP nutrient removal rates
- Acres of BMP implementation



Analytical Framework

step process to identify the least-cost solution (representing the trading outcome)

ptimization model used always seeks least cost BMPs first as available within other constraints (basin, state, local water quality, etc.)





Cost-Effectiveness of Ag BMPs and Stormwater for N Removal Vary Widely

AGRICULTURAL BMPs



*Value ranges for dry ponds and street sweeping are above \$1,000/lb



URBAN STORMWATER BMPs

50-75th

25–50th



The Findings

Cost of Meeting SigPS Load Reduction Targets No-Trading v. In-Basin-State Trading



Cost of Meeting SigPS Load Reduction Targets

	Total SigPS Nutrient Control Costs		Tot BM	Total Agricultural BMP Costs		Potential Cost Savi from Trading		ngs
No Trading	i. 		÷			j. 	=	
								-
Cin DC In-Basin-State Trading	1 1		ļ.				20%	
In-State Trading							24%	
In-Basin Trading			1				21%	
Watershed-wide Trading	1	g.			28%		: 8%	
							1	
CimDC In-Basin-State Trading					36%			
In-State Trading	÷.		:		1	37%		
AGINPS In-Basin Trading					1	44%	į	
TRAD Watershed-wide Trading	1		:	-	1	49%	ŧ	
0	50	100	150	200	250	300	350	400
	Millions of dollars per year							

Cost of Meeting SigPS AND Regulated Urban Stormwater Load Reduction Targets



Cost of Offsets for Added Capacity at Municipal SigPS Long Term Offset-Only Trading Scenarios



Summary of Findings

Potential Cost Savings (%) from Nutrient Credit Trading

Savings expressed as a percent of TMDL compliance costs for significant point sources with no trading, except for the last column, where the savings are expressed as the percent of TMDL compliance costs for significant point sources and urban stormwater sources *combined*.

Potential Cost Savings (%) from Trading to Offset New Loads

Savings expressed as a percent of costs due to additional treatment capacity at wastewater treatment plants. Does not include costs from land use changes.





Increasing Geographic Scope



Local Water Quality Protection



Keys to a Successful Trading Program





Current Trading Programs Virginia, Maryland and Pennsylvania

Current Trading Programs: VA, MD & PA

Authority

VA & PA – direct Code authority and regulations MD – general Code authority & policy

Who can trade?

 VA – Point sources: buy & sell, buy from NPS; New development (SW) buy from approved sources; Voluntary
 MD & PA- Point sources, nonpoint sources, third parties; Voluntary

What can be traded?

VA- Point sources N for N, P for P; PS-PS ratio 1:1, PS-NPS ratio 2:1 New development P for P ratio 1:1, retires N, permanent
MD- N for N, P for P, require net load decrease, 5% retirement ratio for PS credits and 10% for NPS credits
PA- N for N, P for P, 10% required credit reserve

Current Trading Programs: VA, MD & PA Where can trades occur?

VA- within major river basins; Eastern Shore with Potomac
 MD- within major river basins; Eastern & Western Shore with
 Susquehanna
 PA- within major river basins; pilot program between basin approved
 and Potomac basin with West VA considered

Eligibility (CANNOT degrade local water quality) VA- PS below TMDL WLA can sell, buy to comply; NPS generate if baseline met, land conversion; credits already generated MD- PS and NPS that go beyond baseline can sell; limit Ag land conversion

PA- PS and NPS baseline is any legal requirements plus Ag has threshold performance level; limit Ag land conversion

Current Trading Programs: VA, MD & PA

Certification

VA- PS permit compliance, NPS specific activity approval
 MD- DE P permit compliance & certification, MDA farm visit certification
 PA- DEP "proposed" activity approval; valid 5 years, renewal

Verification

VA – DEQ inspections and compliance audits
 MD- DEP PS compliance; DA verifies Ag credits
 PA- Self-verification or 3rd party; DEP can inspect & audit

Registration

VA- PS credits generated/used annually; NPS Credit Registry tracks MD- Credits are "numbered", posted to MD Trading Registry PA- Credits are numbered and tracked

Questions?

Jack E. Frye Virginia Director Chesapeake Bay Commission 804-786-4849 jfrye@chesbay.us www.chesbay.us

