
ADVANCES IN WATER QUALITY TRADING AS A FLEXIBLE COMPLIANCE TOOL

A Special Publication

2015

Water Environment Federation
601 Wythe Street
Alexandria, VA 22314-1994 USA
<http://www.wef.org>

Advances in Water Quality Trading as a Flexible Compliance Tool

Copyright © 2015 by the Water Environment Federation. All Rights Reserved. Permission to copy must be obtained from WEF.

Water Environment Research, WEF, and WEFTEC are registered trademarks of the Water Environment Federation®.

ISBN 978-1-57278-315-7

IMPORTANT NOTICE

The material presented in this publication has been prepared in accordance with generally recognized engineering principles and practices and is for general information only. This information should not be used without first securing competent advice with respect to its suitability for any general or specific application.

The contents of this publication are not intended to be a standard of the Water Environment Federation® (WEF) and are not intended for use as a reference in purchase specifications, contracts, regulations, statutes, or any other legal document.

No reference made in this publication to any specific method, product, process, or service constitutes or implies an endorsement, recommendation, or warranty thereof by WEF.

WEF makes no representation or warranty of any kind, whether expressed or implied, concerning the accuracy, product, or process discussed in this publication and assumes no liability.

Anyone using this information assumes all liability arising from such use, including but not limited to infringement of any patent or patents.

About WEF

Founded in 1928, the Water Environment Federation (WEF) is a not-for-profit technical and educational organization of 36,000 individual members and 75 affiliated Member Associations representing water quality professionals around the world. WEF members, Member Associations, and staff proudly work to achieve our mission to provide bold leadership, champion innovation, connect water professionals, and leverage knowledge to support clean and safe water worldwide. To learn more, visit www.wef.org.

For information on membership, publications, and conferences, contact

Water Environment Federation
601 Wythe Street
Alexandria, VA 22314-1994 USA
(703) 684-2400
<http://www.wef.org>

**Prepared by the Advances in Water Quality Trading as a Flexible Compliance
Tool Task Force of the Water Environment Federation**

Mark S. Kieser, *Co-Chair*
Charles Logue, P.E., *Co-Chair*

Archis Ambulkar, M.S.
Rich Atoulikian PMP, BCEE,
P.E.
Jeremy Bauer
Lee J. Beetschen, P.E., DEE
Julia Bond
Seth Brown
John Buzzone, P.E.
Chein-Chi Chang, Ph.D., P.E.
Bobby Cochran, Ph.D.
Ernest U. Earn
Brent Fewell
Matt Fisher
Jessica Fox
Joe Furia
Douglas “Dusty” Hall
Sarah Hippensteel Hall, Ph.D.
David L. Jaeger
Cy Jones
George Kelly
Mark S. Kieser
James Klang, P.E.

Eric Lynne, P.E.
Benjamin Maloney
Henry Manguerra, Ph.D., P.E.
T.J. Mascia
G. Tracy Mehan, III
Dennis O’Grady
Karin Power
David Primozich
Jill Ravel
Jane Rice
Mindy Selman
Brooks M. Smith
Jeremy Sokulsky, P.E., MBA
Ann Sorensen
Paul E. Stacey
Kaola Swanson
Brandon C. Vatter
Sara Walker
Michel Wanna, PMP
Robert A. Weimar, P.E., BCEE
Tim Wigington
Harry Zhang, Ph.D., P.E.
George Zukovs, M. Eng., P.
Eng., D. WRE

Under the Direction of the **Watershed Subcommittee** of the **Technical Practice Committee**

2015

Water Environment Federation
601 Wythe Street
Alexandria, VA 22314-1994 USA
<http://www.wef.org>

Special Publications of the Water Environment Federation

The WEF Technical Practice Committee (formerly the Committee on Sewage and Industrial Wastes Practice of the Federation of Sewage and Industrial Wastes Associations) was created by the Federation Board of Control on October 11, 1941. The primary function of the Committee is to originate and produce, through appropriate subcommittees, special publications dealing with technical aspects of the broad interests of the Federation. These publications are intended to provide background information through a review of technical practices and detailed procedures that research and experience have shown to be functional and practical.

Water Environment Federation Technical Practice Committee Control Group

Eric Rothstein, C.P.A., *Chair*

Dan Medina, *Vice-Chair*

Jeanette Brown, P.E., BCEE, D.
WRE, F.WEF, *Past Chair*

V. D'Amato

M. Beezhold

K. Bell

J. Davis

C. DeBarbadillo

S. Fitzgerald

S. Gluck

B. Green

M. Hines

B. Jones

R. Lagrange

J. Loudon

S. Metzler

J. Miller

J. Newton

C. Peot

R. Pope

R. Porter

L. Pugh

J. Reeves

A. Salveson

S. Schwartz

A. Shaw

R. Tsuchihashi

J.E. Welp

N. Wheatley

Contents

List of Figures	xxiii	
List of Tables	xxv	
Preface	xvii	
Chapter 1	Introduction, History, and Concept	1
	<i>G. Tracy Mehan, III</i>	
1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s 2003 Water Quality Trading Policy	1
1.2	Water Environment Federation’s 2006 Water Quality Trading Guide	3
1.3	Why Another Volume on Water Quality Trading Now? A Preview	5
1.4	Challenges to Adoption and Implementation of Water Quality Trading	9
1.5	A Pressing Need for Water Quality Trading	11
2.0	A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE TRADING CONCEPT	11
2.1	Water Markets in the West	11
2.2	Acid Rain Trading and Phase-Out of Lead in Gasoline	12
3.0	GENERAL CONCEPTS OF RELEVANCE TO WATER QUALITY TRADING	14
3.1	Sound Program Design and Implementation	14
3.2	Multiple Environmental Benefits and Water Quality Trading	15
3.3	Hope, Realism, and Managing Expectations	16
4.0	REFERENCES	17
Chapter 2	Elements Affecting the Water Sector of Water Quality Trading—Point Sources and Nonpoint Sources	19
	<i>Charles Logue, P.E. and Brent Fewell</i>	

1.0	HISTORY OF POINT- AND NON-POINT-SOURCE TRADING	20
1.1	History of Water Pollutant Trading	20
1.2	Federal–State Partnership	20
	1.2.1 1996 and 2003 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Policy	21
	1.2.2 U.S. Department of Agriculture Efforts	23
	1.2.3 State Policies and Regulations	24
2.0	WATER QUALITY TRADING FRAMEWORK	24
2.1	Types of Trading Programs/Partners	24
2.2	Regulatory Drivers	25
2.3	Elements of Enforceable Trade	26
	2.3.1 Compliance with the Clean Water Act	26
	2.3.2 Quality and Duration of Credits	27
	2.3.3 Baseline Concept and Its Importance	28
	2.3.4 Trading Ratios	28
3.0	BENEFITS AND RISKS OF TRADING PROGRAMS	29
3.1	Benefits of Trading	29
3.2	Risks of Trading	30
4.0	INSTITUTIONAL CHALLENGES AND BARRIERS	31
4.1	Strict Compliance Versus Maximum Extent Practicable	31
4.2	Actual Load Reductions Versus Modeled Load Reductions	32
4.3	Risk-Averse Nature of Public Utilities and Local/State Governments	32
4.4	Equitable Considerations	33
5.0	REFERENCES	34
6.0	SUGGESTED READING	36
Chapter 3	Current Policy Directions	37
	<i>Cy Jones and Mindy Selman</i>	
1.0	INTRODUCTION	37
2.0	FEDERAL WATER QUALITY TRADING POLICY AND GUIDANCE, 2013–2014	38
2.1	National Policy Development	39
	2.1.1 2011–2012 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Regulatory Review	39

2.1.2	<i>Other Current Activity</i>	40
2.1.2.1	<i>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and U.S. Department of Agriculture Memorandum of Understanding, 2013</i>	40
2.1.2.2	<i>Office of Environmental Markets, U.S. Department of Agriculture</i>	40
2.1.2.3	<i>New Stormwater Rule and Trading</i>	41
2.2	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Regional Policy Development	42
2.2.1	<i>Sector Load Growth Demonstration</i>	44
2.2.2	<i>Accounting for Uncertainty in Offset and Trading Programs</i>	45
2.2.3	<i>Components of Credit Calculation</i>	46
2.2.4	<i>Local Water Quality Protection When Using Credits for National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit Issuance and Compliance</i>	47
3.0	NONFEDERAL DEVELOPMENT OF POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS	47
3.1	National Network on Water Quality Trading	47
3.2	Pacific Northwest Joint Regional Statement	48
4.0	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	49
5.0	REFERENCES	50
Chapter 4	Financial, Environmental, and Social Effects of Water Quality Trading <i>Ann Sorensen and Benjamin Maloney</i>	53
1.0	BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE	54
2.0	FINANCIAL EFFECTS	55
2.1	Factors that Influence Market Activity and Financial Outcomes	55
2.2	Does Water Quality Trading Reduce the Cost of Compliance with Water Quality Based Requirements?	58
2.3	Can Trading between Point Sources Generate Savings?	59
2.4	Does Trading between Point Sources and Nonpoint Sources Meet Expectations of Cost-Effectiveness?	61
2.5	Does the Type of Market Matter?	63

2.6	Does the Type of Credit Matter?	64
2.7	Are Regulatory Drivers Necessary for Trading Activity?	66
2.8	Does It Matter if Trading Systems Are Open or Closed?	67
3.0	ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS	68
3.1	Tying Water Quality Trading to Water Quality Improvements	68
3.2	Encouraging Early Progress toward Meeting Water Quality Standards	70
3.3	Achieving Greater Environmental Benefits for the Watershed	72
3.4	Securing Long-Term Improvements in Water Quality (Retirement of Credits)	74
3.5	Encouraging Watershed-Based Approaches	75
3.6	Providing Flexibility	76
3.7	Increasing the Effectiveness of Voluntary Incentives and Fostering Technical Innovation	76
3.8	Avoiding Environmental Justice Effects	78
4.0	SOCIAL EFFECTS	79
4.1	Encouraging Productive Dialogue	79
4.2	Allowing for Greater Flexibility	79
4.3	Offsetting New Discharges to Maintain Water Quality and Allow New Growth	80
4.4	Achieving Other Social Benefits	82
5.0	CONCLUSIONS	83
6.0	REFERENCES	84
7.0	SUGGESTED READINGS	92
Chapter 5	Legal Challenges to Trading	93
	<i>T.J. Mascia, Brooks M. Smith, Joe Furia, Karin Power, and Tim Wigington</i>	
1.0	SOURCES OF AUTHORITY FOR, AND LIMITATIONS ON, WATER QUALITY TRADING	94
1.1	Limits on Discharges under the Clean Water Act: Technology-Based Effluent Limitations and Water Quality Based Effluent Limitations	95
	1.1.1 <i>Technology-Based Effluent Limitations</i>	95

1.1.2	<i>Water Quality Based Effluent Limitations</i>	96
1.1.3	<i>Implementing Technology-Based Effluent Limitations and Water Quality Based Effluent Limitations: National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permits</i>	97
1.2	Impairment Listings, Total Maximum Daily Loads, and Total Maximum Daily Load Alternatives	98
1.3	Key Federal Regulations Affecting Water Quality Trading	100
1.4	Antibacksliding and Antidegradation	101
1.4.1	<i>Antibacksliding</i>	101
1.4.2	<i>Antidegradation</i>	103
1.5	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Water Quality Trading Policy	104
1.6	State Laws, Regulations, and Guidance	105
2.0	KEY CASE LAW AFFECTING WATER QUALITY TRADING	107
2.1	<i>Arkansas v Oklahoma</i> , 503 U.S. 91 (1992)	107
2.2	<i>In re Cities of Annandale & Maple Lake</i> , 731 N.W.2d 502 (Minn. 2007)	108
2.3	<i>Friends of Pinto Creek v U.S. Environmental Protection Agency</i> , 504 F.3d 1007 (9th Cir. 2007)	111
2.4	<i>Food & Water Watch v U.S. Environmental Protection Agency</i> , No. 12-1639 (RC) 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 174430 (D.D.C. Dec. 13, 2013)	114
3.0	CONTEXTUAL ANALYSIS OF LEGAL CHALLENGES AND IMPEDIMENTS TO WATER QUALITY TRADING	115
3.1	If Trading Is Opposed, How Can It Be Challenged?	115
3.2	To Guard against Challenge, Sources Can Design Trades to Ensure Compliance with 40 C.F.R. §§ 122.4 and 122.44	115
3.3	How Can Trading Receive Widespread Support by Advancing the Goals and Objectives of the Clean Water Act?	117
4.0	MECHANISMS TO IMPROVE LEGAL DEFENSIBILITY OF WATER QUALITY TRADING	118

4.1	Specific State Statutory Authority and Enforceable Implementation Detail	118
4.2	Watershed-Based Permitting	119
4.3	Total Maximum Daily Loads with Explicit Authorization for Water Quality Trading and Strong Trading-Related Direction for Implementation	121
4.4	Rigorous Accountability Framework	122
4.5	“Reasonable Further Progress” toward Restoration Goals and Objectives	123
5.0	NEXT GENERATION OPPORTUNITIES	124
5.1	Consensus Framework and Standards for Water Quality Trading	124
5.2	Targeted Changes to U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Regulations	124
5.3	Reaffirmation of Water Quality Trading Policy with Further Clarification and Detail on Key Issues	125
6.0	REFERENCES	127
Chapter 6	The Future of Water Quality Trading <i>Robert A. Weimar, P.E., BCEE; Seth Brown; and Brandon C. Vatter</i>	133
1.0	INTRODUCTION	134
2.0	INTEGRATED WATERSHED MANAGEMENT WILL FACILITATE WATER QUALITY TRADING IN THE FUTURE	136
2.1	Water Quality Trading Will Become Inextricably Intertwined with Total Maximum Daily Loads and Integrated Watershed Management	139
2.2	Water Quality Trading Will Become Inextricably Intertwined with Stormwater and Integrated Watershed Management	140
2.3	Stormwater and Water Quality Trading Today	142
2.3.1	<i>Stormwater Inter-Entity Trading—Chesapeake Bay Total Maximum Daily Load</i>	142
2.3.2	<i>Stormwater Intra-Entity Trading—Stormwater Trading in the District of Columbia and Beyond</i>	144

	2.3.2.1 <i>District of Columbia Stormwater Volume Trading Program</i>	144
	2.3.2.2 <i>Other Market-Based Programs</i>	145
	2.3.3 <i>Conclusion</i>	147
3.0	THE NEW WATERSHED TOOLBOX	148
3.1	Governance Tools: Establishment of Watershed Districts for Everyone’s Environmental Benefit	148
	3.1.1 <i>Creation of Watershed Districts</i>	149
	3.1.2 <i>Creation of Stormwater Districts</i>	149
	3.1.3 <i>State-Wide Rules to Establish Local Minimum Standards for Stormwater Runoff Quality</i>	149
	3.1.4 <i>Conservation Districts</i>	149
	3.1.5 <i>Real Estate Fees</i>	150
	3.1.6 <i>Private Owner Watershed Training and Education Programs: Public Benefit from Private Actions</i>	150
	3.1.7 <i>Educating the Public: Programs from Kindergarten to Adult Education</i>	151
3.2	Regulatory Enforcement Tools: Legal Tools to Facilitate Trading	151
	3.2.1 <i>National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permits in Place of Consent Orders</i>	151
	3.2.2 <i>Watershed Permits</i>	152
	3.2.3 <i>Is a Stormwater Rule Needed if Integrated Waste Management Is Practiced?</i>	152
	3.2.4 <i>Use of Watershed Water Quality Impact Fees</i>	153
3.3	Maintenance of Pollution Control Tools: A Public Collaboration Lexicon	153
	3.3.1 <i>Green Infrastructure Becomes the Norm—Dedicated Funding Sources</i>	153
	3.3.2 <i>Optimizing the Public–Private Maintenance Workforce</i>	155
	3.3.3 <i>Generating Public Commitment to Water Quality Features</i>	155

4.0	ACHIEVING WIDESPREAD USE OF WATER QUALITY TRADING TOOLS: SHOWING HOW THE TOOLS BENEFIT THE PUBLIC	156
4.1	Watershed-Wide Water Quality Monitoring to Continuously Inform	156
4.2	Public Messaging of the Benefits of Water Quality Trading	157
4.3	Present Water Quality Trading as a Means to Manage Public Water Costs	157
4.4	Present Clear, Unambiguous, “Clean Water Requires Everyone” Message across All Stakeholders	157
5.0	REFERENCES	158
Chapter 7	Chesapeake Bay States: Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Maryland <i>Cy Jones, Jill Ravel, Mindy Selman, and Sara Walker</i>	161
1.0	INTRODUCTION	161
1.1	Chesapeake Bay Restoration Efforts	161
1.2	Chesapeake Bay Total Maximum Daily Load	162
1.3	Purpose and Contents of Chapter 7	163
2.0	STATE TRADING PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT	164
2.1	Pennsylvania	164
2.2	Virginia	167
2.3	Maryland	171
2.4	District of Columbia Stormwater Volume Retention Program	173
3.0	COST SAVINGS AND ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS	175
4.0	LESSONS LEARNED	177
4.1	Science	178
4.2	Governance	178
4.3	Costs and Economic Considerations	178
4.4	Interstate Trading	178
5.0	REFERENCES	178

Chapter 8	Case Study of Trading in the Great Miami River Watershed, Ohio	183
	<i>Sarah Hippensteel Hall, Ph.D., and Douglas “Dusty” Hall</i>	
1.0	INTRODUCTION	183
1.1	Background	183
1.2	Watershed Conditions and Challenges	185
1.3	History of the Miami Conservancy District	187
2.0	DRIVERS FOR TRADING	188
3.0	PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT	189
3.1	Building Trust	189
3.2	Collaboration and Partnerships	191
3.3	Economic Analysis	192
3.4	Founding Investor’s Group	193
4.0	PROGRAM DESIGN	193
4.1	Trades/Credits	193
4.2	Eligibility	194
4.3	Quantification of Nutrient Reductions	194
4.4	Reverse Auction	195
4.5	Selection of Projects	195
4.6	Contracting	196
4.7	Checks and Balances	196
5.0	PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION	197
6.0	FUTURE CHALLENGES	198
7.0	REFERENCES	200
Chapter 9	Minnesota	203
	<i>James Klang, P.E.</i>	
1.0	OVERVIEW OF TRADING IN MINNESOTA	204
1.1	Introduction	204
1.2	Background/Setup	204
2.0	PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT	206
2.1	Legal Authority	206
	2.1.1 <i>Water Quality Trading Drivers</i>	206

2.1.2	<i>Rahr Malting Company (1997)</i>	207
2.1.3	<i>Southern Minnesota Beet Sugar Cooperative (1999)</i>	209
2.1.4	<i>The Annandale–Maple Lake Pre Total Maximum Daily Load Offset Permit</i>	212
2.1.5	<i>Minnesota River Basin General Phosphorus Permit—Phase 1 (2005)</i>	212
2.1.6	<i>Pre Total Maximum Daily Load Phosphorus Trading Strategy</i>	214
2.2	Development of State Rules	214
2.2.1	<i>Overview of Draft Rules</i>	214
2.2.2	<i>Advancements Foreseen by Rule Implementation</i>	214
2.2.3	<i>Noticeable Omissions Regarding Nonpoint Sources</i>	215
3.0	ADVANCES AND CHALLENGES	215
3.1	Advances in Trading Using Permit Provisions	215
3.2	Trading Challenges When Operating without Policy or Rules	216
3.3	Legal Challenges to Trading and Offset Programs	217
3.3.1	<i>The Cities of Annandale and Maple Lake Offset Purchases (Minnesota Center for Environmental Advocacy Lawsuit)</i>	217
3.3.2	<i>Petition Requesting Correction or Withdrawal of Minnesota’s Approved National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Program</i>	218
4.0	CONCLUSIONS	219
5.0	REFERENCES	220
Chapter 10	California	223
	<i>Mark S. Kieser, Jane Rice, and Jeremy Sokulsky, P.E., MBA</i>	
1.0	OVERVIEW	223
2.0	PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT—TAHOE	224
2.1	Drivers	224

2.2	Program Design/Framework	226
2.3	Methods of Quantification and Verification	228
2.4	Program Management System	229
3.0	ADVANCES AND CHALLENGES—TAHOE	229
3.1	Benefits Achieved	229
3.2	Legal or Other Challenges	230
4.0	PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT—SANTA ROSA	231
4.1	Drivers	231
4.2	Policies/Rules	233
4.3	Economic Considerations for Offsets	233
4.4	Program Design/Framework	234
4.5	Methods of Quantification and Verification	236
5.0	ADVANCES AND CHALLENGES—SANTA ROSA	236
5.1	Trading Activity	236
5.2	Legal or Other Challenges	236
6.0	LESSONS LEARNED IN CALIFORNIA AND THEIR NATIONAL APPLICATIONS	238
7.0	FUTURE	239
8.0	REFERENCES	240
Chapter 11	North Carolina	243
	<i>Matt Fisher and George Kelly</i>	
1.0	PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF STORMWATER NUTRIENT CONTROL REQUIREMENTS IN NORTH CAROLINA	244
2.0	PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT: REGULATORY HISTORY AND BACKDROP FOR NUTRIENT SENSITIVE WATERS MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES	245
2.1	Point and Non-Point-Source Pollution Control Programs and Regulations	245
2.2	Comprehensive Nutrient Management Requirements	246
2.2.1	<i>Wastewater Discharge Requirements (15A NCAC 02B .0234)</i>	246
2.2.2	<i>Basinwide Stormwater Requirements (15A NCAC 02B .0235)</i>	247
2.2.3	<i>Agricultural Reduction Strategy (15A NCAC 02B .0238)</i>	248

- 2.2.4 *Nutrient Management (Fertilizer)*
(15A NCAC 02B .0239) 248
 - 2.2.5 *Program for Protection and Maintenance of*
Existing Riparian Buffers and Associated
Mitigation 249
 - 2.2.6 *Nutrient Offsets* 249
- 3.0 NEW DEVELOPMENT: REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS
AND OPTIONS AVAILABLE TO ACHIEVE NUTRIENT
LOAD REDUCTIONS 250
 - 3.1 Overview of Nutrient Sensitive Waters Load Rates
and How to Generate Nutrient Offset Credits 250
 - 3.2 Nutrient Offset Generating Practices 250
 - 3.3 Preference for Riparian Buffers 250
 - 3.3.1 *Nitrogen Credit Generation* 253
 - 3.3.2 *Phosphorus Credit Generation* 253
 - 3.4 Jordan Lake Delivery Transportation Factor 253
- 4.0 OPTIONS TO MEET NUTRIENT EXPORT
REQUIREMENTS 254
 - 4.1 Nutrient Offsets 254
 - 4.1.1 *Private Nutrient Offset Banking* 255
 - 4.1.2 *North Carolina Department of Water*
Resources Approval and Credit Release
Process for Nutrient Offset Banks 256
 - 4.2 North Carolina Ecosystem Enhancement Program
(In-Lieu Fee) 257
 - 4.2.1 *Nutrient Offset Payments*
(15A NCAC 02B .0240) 257
 - 4.2.2 *In-Lieu Fee Rates (15A NCAC 02B .0274)* 258
- 5.0 PROCESS FOR APPROVAL OF STORMWATER
PERMITTING AND NUTRIENT OFFSET
ACQUISITIONS 258
 - 5.1 Local Grading Permit Process 258
 - 5.2 Process to Purchase Credits from a Third-Party
Provider 259
- 6.0 UPDATES 260
 - 6.1 Credit Stacking 260
 - 6.2 Delay of the Implementation Deadline for
Local Stormwater Management 261

6.3	Liability for Existing Development by Local Governments	261
7.0	CONCLUSION	262
8.0	REFERENCES	263
9.0	SUGGESTED READINGS	264
Chapter 12	Connecticut’s Long Island Sound Nitrogen Credit Exchange <i>Paul E. Stacey</i>	265
1.0	OVERVIEW	265
1.1	Introduction	265
1.2	Background and Origin of Connecticut’s Nitrogen Credit Exchange	266
1.3	Basic Program Origins	268
2.0	PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT	270
2.1	Regulatory and Economic Drivers	270
2.2	Policies/Rules	271
2.3	Program Design and Framework	272
2.4	Functionality of the Nitrogen Credit Exchange	274
2.5	Administration	275
3.0	ADVANCES AND CHALLENGES	276
3.1	Trading Activity	276
3.2	Benefits Achieved	277
3.3	Legal and Other Challenges	281
3.4	Future of Connecticut’s Nitrogen Credit Exchange	283
4.0	CONCLUSIONS	284
5.0	REFERENCES	285
Chapter 13	Oregon’s Case Study in the Evolution of Water Quality Trading <i>Bobby Cochran, Ph.D.; David Primozich; Kaola Swanson; and Tim Wigington</i>	289
1.0	OVERVIEW	289
1.1	Evolution of Trading Programs in Oregon	290
1.2	Program Development	293

2.0	TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOADS AND NATIONAL POLLUTANT DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM PERMIT LIMITS DRIVE DEMAND	294
2.1	Need for Standardization	294
2.2	Economic Challenges Meet Ecological Needs	295
2.3	Implementing a Trading Program in Oregon	296
2.4	Lessons Learned	299
	2.4.1 <i>What Worked and Why</i>	299
	2.4.2 <i>What Did Not Work and Why</i>	300
2.5	Future of Trading in Oregon	301
	2.5.1 <i>Challenges to Overcome to Expand Water Quality Trading in Oregon</i>	301
	2.5.2 <i>Current Efforts to Overcome Challenges to Trading</i>	302
3.0	CONCLUSIONS	303
4.0	REFERENCES	303
Chapter 14	Water Quality Trading in Ontario: The South Nation River and Lake Simcoe Experiences	307
	<i>Dennis O’Grady and George Zukovs, M. Eng., P. Eng., D. WRE</i>	
1.0	INTRODUCTION	308
2.0	RESPONSIBILITY FOR PROTECTING WATER QUALITY	308
3.0	STATE OF WATER QUALITY AND THE NEED FOR TRADING	309
	3.1 Great Lakes	309
	3.2 Inland Lakes	310
	3.3 Rivers and Streams	310
4.0	ONTARIO WATER QUALITY TRADING PROGRAM ORIGINS	311
5.0	EXAMPLES OF ONTARIO TRADING	312
	5.1 Lake Simcoe Phosphorus Offset Program	312
	5.2 New Tecumseth Phosphorus Load Offsetting Program	314
	5.3 Regional Municipality of Waterloo Rural Water Quality Program	315
6.0	CASE STUDY: SOUTH NATION RIVER TOTAL PHOSPHORUS MANAGEMENT	315
	6.1 Overview	315

6.2	Water Quality and the Need for Trading	316
6.3	Economics of Trading	316
6.4	Program Design: Stakeholder and Public Agreement	317
6.5	Preferred Governance Model	319
6.6	Simplicity	319
6.7	Farmers Helping Farmers	320
6.8	Legal Responsibility	320
6.9	Technical Basis of Trading: Credit Estimation and Valuation	321
6.10	Development of Instruments for Trading and Verification	321
6.11	Public Opinion	322
	6.11.1 Overall Experience with the Program	322
	6.11.2 Accomplishments and Direct Benefits	323
7.0	CONCLUSIONS	323
8.0	REFERENCES	324
Chapter 15	Concluding Remarks	327
	<i>Mark S. Kieser</i>	
1.0	THE CASE FOR TRADING—ARE WE THERE YET?	327
	1.1 Recap of Trading Diversity	328
	1.2 Pilots, Projects, and Programs	328
2.0	COMMON THREADS OF SUCCESS	331
	2.1 Recap of Successes from Previous Chapters	331
	2.2 Why We Trade	332
3.0	BARRIERS OR OPPORTUNITIES?	333
	3.1 Recap of Barriers from Previous Chapters	333
	3.2 How Barriers Were Turned into Opportunities	334
4.0	OUT WITH THE OLD AND IN WITH THE NEW	335
	4.1 Regulatory Stalemate Versus Innovation	335
	4.2 The Need for Consistent Trading Application	335
	4.3 Future Outlook and Summary of Publication Objectives	336
5.0	REFERENCES	337
	Index	339

List of Figures

5.1	Determining trading baseline options	120
6.1	Integrated watershed management develops the pollution pie chart for the watershed	137
6.2	Integrated watershed management provides a business case focus for watershed health improvements.	138
6.3	In the future, WQT will be used together with IWM to achieve the same goals as TMDLs, but at a lower cost	140
8.1	Great Miami River watershed	186
8.2	Flow chart	189
9.1	Minnesota River basin map and locations of key trading permits.	205
10.1	Secchi depth decline in Lake Tahoe with the estimated recovery from implementing the Lake Tahoe TMDL, including arresting clarity decline and achieving the Clarity Challenge by 2025	225
10.2	Combined Lake Clarity Credit targets for all urban jurisdictions. Each jurisdiction has a unique credit target defined in their NPDES permit (California) or interlocal agreement (Nevada)	227
10.3	Relationship of pollution controls to the suite of stormwater tools used by urban jurisdictions to estimate load reductions (PLRM), inspect and verify conditions (RAMs), track progress (Credit Accounting Platform), report accomplishments (Performance Platform), and monitor effectiveness (RSWMP).	228
10.4	Location of the Laguna de Santa Rosa River Basin in Northern California	232
10.5	Preliminary Laguna de Santa Rosa WQT framework being prepared for pre-TMDL offsets and TMDL trading, as of this writing	235
11.1	Riparian buffer credit generation	260
12.1	More than 20 years of monitoring by CTDEEP has identified areas of recurrent hypoxia (dissolved oxygen less than 3.0 mg/L) in Long Island Sound	267

12.2 Area (square miles) of hypoxia (dissolved oxygen less than 3 mg/L), 5-year moving average of area, and area of anoxia (dissolved oxygen less than 1.0 mg/L) from 1987 through 2013 268

12.3 Baseline loads (tons/yr) of nitrogen delivered to Long Island Sound from Connecticut and New York sources (tons \times 907.18 = kg) 269

12.4 Connecticut trading zones with trading ratios (top) and distribution and relative size of POTWs in the NCE. 273

12.5 Annual aggregate performance (diagonal fill) of POTWs in the NCE compared to permit limits (solid fill) for the base year and 2002 to 2012. The final WLA is the 2014 target of 9165 e-lb/d, which was attained in 2012 (e-lb/d \times 0.45 = e-kg/d) 278

12.6 Cost per credit in U.S. dollars (bar) and cumulative credits produced (line) for 47 POTWs project facilities in 2012. 280

13.1 Transaction model for WQT 296

List of Tables

3.1	U.S. EPA Region 3 technical memoranda on water quality trading	45
3.2	National network participants	49
6.1	Possible list of watershed water quality impairment sources and potential revenue sources	154
7.1	Key provisions of Pennsylvania’s WQT program	166
7.2	Key provisions of Virginia’s WQT program	170
7.3	Cumulative nitrogen and phosphorus credit purchases and sales within the Exchange as of June 2012	171
7.4	Key provisions of Maryland’s WQT program	174
7.5	Annual cost savings for point-source to point-source and point-source to agricultural NPS trading	176
7.6	Annual cost savings for point-source to point-source and point-source/urban stormwater to agricultural NPS trading	177
8.1	Trading ratios.	195
9.1	Rahr Malting Company WQT credit transaction summary . .	208
9.2	Southern Minnesota Beet Sugar Cooperative WQT credit transaction summary	211
11.1	Watersheds in North Carolina with strategies developed	246
11.2	Comprehensive nutrient management requirements	247
11.3	Comparison of required nutrient load rates	251
11.4	Nutrient reduction practices and removal efficiencies.	252
11.5	Nitrogen calculations	253
11.6	Calculations of phosphorus water quality benefits from riparian buffer restoration.	254
11.7	Nutrient offset criteria	255
11.8	Credit release schedule for riparian buffer restoration	256
11.9	Credit release schedule for stormwater BMPs	257
11.10	2013 NCEEP in-lieu fee rates.	258
12.1	Performance statistics of the NCE (2002 to 2012).	277

12.2	Costs and credits generated by nitrogen removal projects at POTWs participating in the NCE (2002 to 2012) (e-lb \times 0.45 = e-kg).....	279
13.1	Temperature transaction model in summary	297
14.1	Cost comparison, TPM vs lagoon treatment	317
15.1	Summary of North American trading programs.....	329

Preface

The Water Environment Federation established a Task Force to develop a publication that would serve as a resource for its members and other interested stakeholders for implementing and using water quality trading for regulatory compliance purposes. Industry experts believe that the use of water quality trading as a regulatory compliance tool has progressed sufficiently over the last decade to the point where its members and stakeholders could benefit from a compilation of case histories, regulatory successes, and emerging legal support.

To that purpose, this publication builds on the initial 2006 WEF publication, *Water Quality Trading: A Guide for the Wastewater Community*, to showcase the advances in the use of water quality trading programs and approaches as a flexible regulatory/permitting compliance tool.

The 2006 publication was intended to serve, as its title indicates, as a guide to water quality trading. The Task Force members in writing this latest publication focused on the practitioner, the entity/person who was looking to implement a water quality trading program to assist with meeting its permit compliance requirements. This publication is structured to support the reader with a general background of the impetus of water quality trading; potential uses for a water quality trading program; current policy directions; the significant legal underpinning and case law that has emerged in support of these compliance programs; the future of water quality trading programs; and, most importantly, a broad compilation of eight actual case histories from across the United States and Canada that illustrate the breadth of water quality trading program implementation. The intent of the publication is to be a valuable practical resource for the planning and implementation of a water quality trading program to support regulatory compliance in a more natural system and cost-effective manner than traditional engineered compliance tools and strategies.

Each case history will provide the reader with

- Background of the specific water quality trading program,
- Drivers for the trading program,
- Program development,
- Program design,
- Program implementation, and
- Future of the program.

This publication's final chapter investigates the common threads of success for a water quality trading program.

This Special Publication was produced under the direction of Mark S. Kieser, *Co-Chair*, and Charles Logue, *Co-Chair*.

In addition to the WEF Task Force and Technical Practice Committee Control Group members, reviewers include "Andrew" Feng Fang and Lola Guerra.

Authors' and reviewers' efforts were supported by the following organizations:

Alfa Laval Inc., Richmond, Virginia
American Farmland Trust, DeKalb, Illinois
CABE Associates, Inc., Dover, Delaware
CH2M HILL, Chantilly, Virginia
Cobb County Water System, Marietta, Georgia
Conestoga-Rovers & Associates (CRA), Shelby Township, Michigan
DC Water, Washington, D.C.
Donohue & Associates, Sheboygan, Wisconsin
Environmental Banc & Exchange, LLC (EBX), Owings Mills,
Maryland, and Raleigh, North Carolina
Environmental Incentives, LLC, South Lake Tahoe, California
Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI), Palo Alto, California
Great Bay National Estuarine Research Reserve, New Hampshire Fish
& Game Department, Durham, New Hampshire
Hatch Mott MacDonald, Cincinnati, Ohio
HDR Engineering, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio
Kieser & Associates, LLC, Kalamazoo, Michigan
Loudoun Water, Ashburn, Virginia
Macon Water Authority, Macon, Georgia
Miami Conservancy District, Dayton, Ohio
Michael Baker Jr., Inc., Alexandria, Virginia
South Nation Conservation, Finch, Ontario, Canada
Southwestern Ohio Council for Higher Education, Dayton, Ohio
Stantec, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada
The Freshwater Trust, Portland, Oregon
Troutman Sanders LLP, Richmond, Virginia, and Washington, D.C.
URS, La Jolla, California
Willamette Partnership, Portland, Oregon
World Resources Institute, Washington, D.C.
XCG Consultants, Ltd., Oakville, Ontario, Canada