### **Pleasant Bay Group**



Watershed Scenarios







- ➢ To discuss the approach for developing watershed scenarios that will remediate water quality impairments in your watersheds.
- To identify preferences, advantages and disadvantages of a set of scenarios of different technologies and approaches, and
- ➢ To develop a set of adaptive management principles to guide subregional groups in refining scenarios for the 208 Plan.

### **208 Planning Process**













#### Watershed-Wide Innovative/Alternative (I/A) Onsite Systems





#### Watershed-Wide Centralized Treatment with Disposal Inside the Watershed



#### Watershed-Wide (Muddy Creek) Innovative/Alternative (I/A)



#### Watershed-Wide (Muddy Creek) Centralized Treatment with Disposal Inside the Watershed









#### Targeted Centralized Treatment with Disposal in Harwich





#### Map Tools Layers Summary Legend WATERSHED M V Pleasant Bay GT 10\_ORLBRE Long Pond GT TO N Freeman's Way WELL BRE Base Map Tar Kiln Stream GT 10 Tar Kiln Stream, LT 10 Planning Scenarios ~ Golf Course Scenario 4 Created By Scott M Cape Cod Pleasant Bay GT 10 BREHAR Ple National ARD Description Muddy Cr Golf Club din Mud Pond Dr Scenario ID 764 - 12/6/2013 12:02:22 PM Greenland Smalls d LT1)= Pond 28 Pleasant Bay LT 10 Find Delete Clear Run New Round Cove GT 10 Link: http://broadband.appgeo.com/WatershedMVP/ Round Cove LT 10 Go to Dashboard Rd Scenario Settings **Treatment Type Settings** Data Summary Olivers 4 Middy Creek Wel Puod Summarize by Nitrogen Load -Eastward H Crows Pond Walker Countr O Future Scenario C Existing Upper Muddy Creek Chart Lower Muddy Nitrogen Load: kg/year 12500 Show/Hide Legend Or/ Ryders Cove MII BORD Fresh 10000 Existing Buck Future Pa MO1 Scenario 7500 QL Upper Muddy C Rd Caller Coler Road 5000 а Chatham 2500 GT10 Rd Spring Brook Total Nitrogen Load Ste Road WELLS See Detailed Comparison Goose Pondase Lover Tay E Harwich Wells Red lors Pond Results Re RIVE Cocke Course Emery Pond Cold Depot 0 Total Number of 1,632 Properties Selected 4 × ic KS N GT10 ham Meet Croat 10 icipal Pund Existing Sewered 0 port Sulfur Springs 10 2 る Total Scenario Cost \$91,192,017.00 White to, Cost/lb of Nitrogen \$605.00 a. Cree Removed Cockle Cox 0 Taylors Pond 28 Costs Sulfur Springs 1 -2

#### Targeted Centralized Treatment with a 50% Reduction in Fertilizer and Stormwater





Watershed Calculator Mudd	y Creek		
MEP Targets and Goals: Present Total Nitrogen	kg/day	Nitrogen (kg/yr)	
Load:	18.458	6,737	
wastewater	13.496	4,926	
fertilizer		612	
stormwater		776	
Target Nitrogen Load:	6.751	2,464	
Chatham Portion to WWTF	1,785		
Nitrogen Removal Required:	6.817	2,488	
Total Number of Properties:	1408		

Watershed Calculator Muddy Creel	k			
MEP Targets and Goals:	ŀ	⟨g/day	Nitrogen (kg/yr)	
Present Total Nitrogen				
Load:		18.458	6,737	
wastewater		13.496	4,926	
fertilizer			612	
stormwater			776	
Target Nitrogen Load:		6.751	2,464	
Chatham Portion to WWTF		1,785		
Nitrogen Removal Required:		6.817	2,488	
Total Number of Properties:1408	3			
Other Wastewater Management Needs	Ponds		Title 5 Problem Areas	Growth Management

Watershed Calculator	Muddy Creek			
MEP Targets and Goals:	-	kg/day	Nitrogen (kg/yr)	
Present Total Nitrogen				
Load:		18.458	6,737	
wastewate	r	13.496	4,926	
fertilize	r		612	
stormwate	r		776	
Target Nitrogen Load:		6.751	2,464	
Chatham Portion to WWTF		1,785		
Nitrogen Removal Required	:	6.817	2,488	
Total Number of Properties:	1408			
Other Wastewater Manage	ment Needs	Ponds Ti	tle 5 Problem Areas	Growth Management
		Reduction by	Remaining to Meet	Lipit Cost (\$/lb N)
Low Barrier to Implementa	ition:	Technology (Kg/	yr) Target (Kg/yr)	
Fertilizer Management		306	2,182	
Stormwater Mitigation		388	1,794	

Watershed Calculator Mudd	y Creek			
MEP Targets and Goals:		kg/day	Nitrogen (kg/yr)	
Present Total Nitrogen		0,00		
Load:		18.458	6,737	
wastewater		13.496	4,926	
fertilizer			612	
stormwater			776	
Target Nitrogen Load:		6.751	2,464	
Chatham Portion to WWTF		1,785		
Nitrogen Removal Required:		6.817	2,488	
Total Number of Properties:	1408			
•				
Other Wastewater Management N	leeds	Ponds Tit	le 5 Problem Areas	Growth Management
Other Wastewater Management N	leeds	Ponds Tit Reduction by Technology (Kg/y	le 5 Problem Areas Remaining to Meet yr) Target (Kg/yr)	Growth Management Unit Cost (\$/lb N)
Other Wastewater Management Management Management Management Action: Fertilizer Management	Veeds	Ponds Tit Reduction by Technology (Kg/y 306	Remaining to Meet Target (Kg/yr) 2,182	Growth Management Unit Cost (\$/lb N)
Other Wastewater Management Management Management Management Fertilizer Management Stormwater Mitigation	leeds	Ponds Tit Reduction by Technology (Kg/y 306 388	rile 5 Problem Areas           Remaining to Meet           Target (Kg/yr)           2,182           1,794	Growth Management Unit Cost (\$/Ib N)
Other Wastewater Management Management Management Management Fertilizer Management Stormwater Mitigation Watershed/Embayment Options:	Veeds	Ponds Tit Reduction by Technology (Kg/y 306 388	Remaining to Meet Target (Kg/yr) 2,182 1,794	Growth Management Unit Cost (\$/lb N)

Watershed Calculator Mu	ddy Creek			
MEP Targets and Goals:		kg/day	Nitrogen (kg/yr)	
Present Total Nitrogen				
Load:		18.458	6,737	
wastewater		13.496	4,926	
fertilizer			612	
stormwater			776	
Target Nitrogen Load:		6.751	2,464	
Chatham Portion to WWTF		1,785		
Nitrogen Removal Required:		6.817	2,488	
Total Number of Properties:	1408			
Other Wastewater Managemen	t Needs	Ponds Title	e 5 Problem Areas	Growth Management
Other Wastewater Managemen	it Needs	Ponds Title Reduction by Technology (Kg/yr	e 5 Problem Areas <b>Remaining to Meet</b> <b>Target (Kg/yr)</b>	Growth Management Unit Cost (\$/Ib N)
Other Wastewater Managemen Low Barrier to Implementation Fertilizer Management	it Needs	Ponds Title Reduction by Technology (Kg/yr 306	<ul> <li>S Problem Areas</li> <li>Remaining to Meet Target (Kg/yr)</li> <li>2,182</li> </ul>	Growth Management Unit Cost (\$/Ib N)
Other Wastewater Management Low Barrier to Implementation Fertilizer Management Stormwater Mitigation	it Needs	Ponds Title Reduction by Technology (Kg/yr 306 388	<ul> <li>5 Problem Areas</li> <li>Remaining to Meet Target (Kg/yr)</li> <li>2,182</li> <li>1,794</li> </ul>	Growth Management
Other Wastewater Management Low Barrier to Implementation Fertilizer Management Stormwater Mitigation Watershed/Embayment Option	it Needs :: is:	Ponds Title Reduction by Technology (Kg/yr 306 388	e 5 Problem Areas Remaining to Meet Target (Kg/yr) 2,182 1,794	Growth Management
Other Wastewater Management Low Barrier to Implementation Fertilizer Management Stormwater Mitigation Watershed/Embayment Option Constructed Wetlands	nt Needs .: ns: 1.5 acres	Ponds Title Reduction by Technology (Kg/yr 306 388 849	e 5 Problem Areas           Remaining to Meet Target (Kg/yr)           2,182           1,794	Growth Management Unit Cost (\$/Ib N) \$521

Watershed Calculator Mud	dy Creek			
MEP Targets and Goals:		kg/day	Nitrogen (kg/yr)	
Present Total Nitrogen				
Load:		18.458	6,737	
wastewater		13.496	4,926	
fertilizer			612	
stormwater			776	
Target Nitrogen Load:		6.751	2,464	
Chatham Portion to WWTF		1,785		
Nitrogen Removal Required:		6.817	2,488	
Total Number of Properties:	1408			
Other Wastewater Management	Needs	Ponds Title !	5 Problem Areas	Growth Management
Low Barrier to Implementation:		Reduction by Technology (Kg/yr)	Remaining to Meet Target (Kg/yr)	Unit Cost (\$/lb N)
Low Barrier to Implementation: Fertilizer Management		Reduction by Technology (Kg/yr) 306	Remaining to Meet Target (Kg/yr) 2,182	Unit Cost (\$/Ib N)
<b>Low Barrier to Implementation:</b> Fertilizer Management Stormwater Mitigation		Reduction by Technology (Kg/yr) 306 388	Remaining to Meet Target (Kg/yr) 2,182 1,794	Unit Cost (\$/Ib N)
Low Barrier to Implementation: Fertilizer Management Stormwater Mitigation Watershed/Embayment Options	:	Reduction by Technology (Kg/yr) 306 388	Remaining to Meet Target (Kg/yr) 2,182 1,794	Unit Cost (\$/Ib N)
Low Barrier to Implementation: Fertilizer Management Stormwater Mitigation Watershed/Embayment Options Constructed Wetlands	: 1.5 acres	Reduction by Technology (Kg/yr) 306 388 849	Remaining to Meet Target (Kg/yr) 2,182 1,794 945	Unit Cost (\$/Ib N) \$521
Low Barrier to Implementation: Fertilizer Management Stormwater Mitigation Watershed/Embayment Options Constructed Wetlands Oyster Beds/Aquaculture	: 1.5 acres 2 acres	Reduction by Technology (Kg/yr) 306 388 849 500	Remaining to Meet           2,182           1,794           945           445	Unit Cost (\$/Ib N) \$521 \$0

Watershed Calculator Mud	dy Cre	ek			
MEP Targets and Goals:			kɑ∕dav	Nitrogen (kg/vr)	
Present Total Nitrogen			<b>J</b>		
Load:			18.458	6,737	
wastewater			13.496	4,926	
fertilizer				612	
stormwater				776	
Target Nitrogen Load:			6.751	2,464	
Chatham Portion to WWTF			1,785		
Nitrogen Removal Required:			6.817	2,488	
Total Number of Properties:	140	)8			
Other Wastewater Management	Needs	P	Ponds 1	Fitle 5 Problem Areas	Growth Management
Low Barrier to Implementation:			Reduction by Technology (Kg	y Remaining to Meet /yr) Target (Kg/yr)	Unit Cost (\$/lb N)
Low Barrier to Implementation: Fertilizer Management			Reduction by Technology (Kg. 306	y Remaining to Meet /yr) Target (Kg/yr) 2,182	Unit Cost (\$/Ib N)
<b>Low Barrier to Implementation:</b> Fertilizer Management Stormwater Mitigation			Reduction by Technology (Kg 306 388	y Remaining to Meet /yr) Target (Kg/yr) 2,182 1,794	Unit Cost (\$/Ib N)
Low Barrier to Implementation: Fertilizer Management Stormwater Mitigation Watershed/Embayment Options	:		Reduction by Technology (Kg 306 388	y Remaining to Meet /yr) Target (Kg/yr) 2,182 1,794	Unit Cost (\$/Ib N)
Low Barrier to Implementation: Fertilizer Management Stormwater Mitigation Watershed/Embayment Options Constructed Wetlands	: 1.5	acres	Reduction by Technology (Kg 306 388 849	y Remaining to Meet /yr) Target (Kg/yr) 2,182 1,794 945	Unit Cost (\$/Ib N) \$521
Low Barrier to Implementation: Fertilizer Management Stormwater Mitigation Watershed/Embayment Options Constructed Wetlands Oyster Beds/Aquaculture	: 1.5 2	acres acres	Reduction by Technology (Kg 306 388 849 500	y Remaining to Meet /yr) Target (Kg/yr) 2,182 1,794 945 445	Unit Cost (\$/Ib N) \$521 \$0
Low Barrier to Implementation: Fertilizer Management Stormwater Mitigation Watershed/Embayment Options Constructed Wetlands Oyster Beds/Aquaculture Floating Constructed Wetlands	: 1.5 2 1000	acres acres cu feet	Reduction by Technology (Kg 306 388 849 500 450	Yyr)         Remaining to Meet Target (Kg/yr)           2,182           1,794           945           445           -5	Unit Cost (\$/lb N) \$521 \$0 \$61

### **Targeted Centralized Treatment after Applying Alternative Strategies**



### **Scenario Comparison**

**Targeted Collection** 



- Achieves TMDL<sup>1</sup>
- ➤ Cost/lb N = \$600
- ➤ Treated Flow = 145,000 gpd

Targeted Collection after a 50% reduction in fertilizer and stormwater



- > Achieves TMDL<sup>1</sup>
- ➤ Cost/lb N = \$600
- ➤ Treated Flow = 125,000 gpd

Targeted Collection after a 50% reduction in fertilizer and stormwater & after applying alternative approaches



- Achieves TMDL<sup>1</sup>
- ➤ Cost/lb N = \$750
- ➤ Treated Flow = 20,000 gpd

#### <sup>1</sup> within 5% of goal

## Adaptive Management:

A structured approach for addressing uncertainties by linking science and monitoring to decision-making and adjusting implementation, as necessary, to increase the probability of meeting water quality goals in a cost effective and efficient way.



# Triple Bottom Line (TBL) Introduction

### What is triple bottom line analysis? Economic development lemployment Air quality Triple Bottom Line Analysis water quality Provides a full accounting of the financial, social, and environmental consequences of investments or policies TBL **Community development** Often "TBL" analysis is used to identify the best alternative and to report to stakeholders on the Natural Resources public outcomes of a given investment.



# Why develop a TBL model?

- To consider the financial, environmental, and social consequences of water quality investments and policies in Cape Cod.
- TBL Model evaluates the "ancillary" or downstream consequences of water quality investments not the direct Phosphorous or Nitrogen levels.







