CBP Management Board
Actions and Decisions
May 16, 2013

II. 2013 Chesapeake Bay Program Partnership Agreement

Drafting Directions to Goal Team 6
- <u>Action</u>: The Management Board (MB) directs Goal Team 6 to consider its discussion notes (copied below) as GIT6 drafts the new CBP Agreement.

Goals
Sustainable Fisheries –
- <u>Decision</u> – Recommend draft Sustainable Fisheries Goal to PSC with no changes.

Vital Habitats
- <u>Decision</u> – Recommend draft Vital Habitats Goal to PSC with no changes.

Water Quality Goal
- <u>Decision</u> – Recommend draft Water Quality Goal to PSC as revised: "Restore Water quality to achieve standards for the Bay watershed."

Healthy Watersheds
- <u>Decision</u> – Recommend draft Healthy Watersheds Habitats Goal to PSC with revisions (forthcoming from GIT4).

Land Conservation
- <u>Decision</u> – Recommend draft Land Conservation Goal to PSC with no changes.

Public Access
- <u>Decision</u> – Recommend draft Public Access Goal to PSC with no changes.

Environmental Literacy
- <u>Decision</u> – Recommend draft Environmental Literacy Goal to PSC as revised: "Every student in the region graduates environmentally literate having participated in meaningful watershed educational experiences."

Gaps in Goals
Toxic Contaminants
- <u>Action</u>: An ad hoc partners workgroup will bring forward options for consideration at the next MB meeting. Anyone interested in participating in the workgroup should contact Scott Phillips (USGS).
- <u>Action</u>: The Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) and the Chesapeake Bay Commission (CBC) both welcome additional discussion (and participation by the ad hoc workgroup members) on toxics contaminants as a goal/outcome during their upcoming meetings.

Social/Economic Indicators
- Decision: Social/economic indicators should be included in the principles section of the new agreement.

Climate Change
- Decision: Climate Change should be addressed in the management strategies and principles sections of the new agreement (rather than as a stand-alone goal since it is cross-cutting). May also mention in the preamble and/or vision).

Outcomes
Fisheries Outcome
- Action: Edits on the fisheries outcome should be sent to Peyton Robertson.

Forest Outcome
- Action: Edits on the forest outcome should be provided to Jeff Horan.

Water Quality Outcome
- Decision: The 2025 WIP outcome is recommend to PSC with no changes.
- Action: The new Water Quality Indicator should be considered as an additional outcome under the Water Quality Goal.

Land Conservation
- Decision: Recommend draft Land Conservation goal to PSC with no changes.

Public Access Site Development Outcome
- Decision: Recommend Public Access Site Development outcome to PSC with no changes.

IV. **Communications: TMDL Language Clarification**
- Action: MB recommends to EPA Region III that the writing errors in the Chesapeake Bay TMDL Executive Summary and the Bay TMDL website regarding "practices in place by 2017" should be corrected to avoid any additional public confusion.

Management Board Discussion Notes on a New Chesapeake Bay Program Agreement

Direction to GIT6 for Drafting Mission and Vision
Responses to "What does restored bay look like?":
- Swimmable, fishable; families enjoying the resources of the watershed
- Can eat fish without worry of contamination
- Abundant native species in and out of water
- Extensive areas of conserved land …reflecting cultural and natural systems
- Ecosystem in balance
- Strong economy based on farming and fisheries (commercial)…also recreation
- Opportunity to be outside near and/or on the water

- Vibrant communities connected to the ecosystem
- Resilient bay that can recover from large storms/weather events
- Healthy lands, farms, forests and maritime
- Streams reconnected to floodplains
- Environmentally literate students
- 75 percent of population engaged in their local waterways
- People understand that impact on land impacts water
- Individual stewardship; public understands how their individual footprint effects the environment

Responses to "What about partnership do we need to take with us into the future?":
- Strong science to make decisions (including social sciences)
- Strong agreement among partners on vision, mission and goals
- Political will;
- Recognition of importance of non-signatories to the vision and mission
- Diverse sources of funding
- Stronger connection between sound science and local decision making
- Positive collaboration/cooperation
- Communication of status and progress
- Collectively defining stretch goals and meeting them
- Positive communications; positive public news and engagement.
- Accountability & transparency
- Community in purpose; unity in goals
- Supporting and enhancing the good work of states
- Recognition of climate change (and strategies for adaptation)
- Adaptive management

Responses to "What do we want to leave in the past?"
- Turf battles
- Political hyperbole
- Too many meetings/bureaucracy
- Litigation
- Bad press
- Political "won't"
- Whining about the model/being defined by the model
- Unrealistic expectations
- Regulatory obstacles to restoration efforts
- Inability to finance work
- Lack of diversity to support restoration
- Placing growth and its impact on back burner
- Poor communication with the public and stakeholders
- Ignoring toxics

What didn't we do well? (and should not focus on)
- Land use because of disparity in local authority approaches
- Toxics

Additional Comments
- Need to appeal to broader cross section of society. Appeal needs to be in vision that cuts across all of society.
- Individual stewardship hasn't been focused on and it will take that from everyone in bay to get to the goal line. People don't know what to do in their homes in their yards with their cars and their energy use.
- We need to figure out best fit for partnership – it can't take on absolutely everything.
- What is important, and what is our role in that being important

Direction to GIT6 for Drafting Principles
- Support for on-the-ground efforts and local government. Need to build on and embrace the work being done by parties who aren't signing on to the agreement…and recognize that there are some things that will never be done by CBP.
- The agreement should represent interests of all people living in the watershed (e.g. include language about people…"work together to restore and protect people's lives, ecosystems," etc... somehow connect in the human dimension.
- Aim to appeal to multiple generations – the core values of the next generation may not be the same.
- There should be a sense that activities are (or will be) place-based, real places with/for real people that can be demonstrated as successful results of this Partnership.
- Decision: Principle 3 needs to be stated more clearly. (Current: "Use best efforts to accomplish the goals of the partnership outlined in Section 4 of this Agreement.")
- Socio-economic indicators

Direction to GIT6 for Operational Commitments
- Management strategies developed by goal teams
- Some form of stakeholder input to strategies
- Separate section in agreement that addresses management strategies (not in operational commitments)
- The Advisory Committees are at the table giving advice & recommendations, and their involvement should probably be reflected in the agreement.
- Communication about work and progress
- Using technology – web, social media
- Continue using technology to communicate success stories (web, social media, mobile)

Direction to GIT6 on other issues
- Climate Change – should be addressed in Management Strategies and in Principles (rather than as a stand-alone goal since it is cross-cutting) to give direction on science-based decision making and adaptive management. May also mention in the preamble and/or vision).
- Resilience – include as a theme in Principles
- Connectivity of air, land and water – preamble should mention inter-connectivity.
- Process/Implementation Commitment – Proposal to be developed by Frank Dawson and Kristin Saunders. Implementation commitments or management strategies to help accelerate bay restoration by taking on key challenges, e.g. regulatory obstacles; financing challenges, problems with model, developing innovative technologies, land use decision

processes, local government engagement etc. These commitments or strategies would help identify what's different about this new agreement and what we are doing to improve outcomes. These ideas could developed as a goal, principles, or operational commitment.

- Name of "Agreement" – may want to consider a different terminology (e.g. "watershed agreement", "action agenda") to reflect the accelerated pace overarching goal. Consider renaming it.
- Place-based focus – may want principles to reflect a shift to more specific, place-based restoration efforts (where people can actually see or visualize restoration efforts).
- Local government engagement – principles may want to reflect greater emphasis on local governments and other partners land use decisions connections.
- Lessons learned – possibly in preamble.
- Technology – may want to capture how we measure progress with new technologies.
- Costs – may want to address rough estimates (ball park) for what the cost of bay restoration will be.