**PSC Meeting Discussion Notes**

**June 27, 2013 meeting**

**Overall Discussion**

Below you will find issues and comments suggested by members and advisory committee representatives at the PSC meeting on June 27, 2013. These comments are only those that were discussed at the meeting. There have been other comments that were received in writing that the Management Board will consider at their July 11-12 retreat, but this paper is an attempt to capture what was discussed and how it will be reflected both in the stakeholder draft that will be released July 3 as well as by the Management Board. The proposed actions to be taken are divided into what the PSC feels can be language in the abridged outline that will go out for stakeholder input on July 3, 2013, and what will be discussed at the Management Board retreat on July 11 and 12. The attached abridged outline of the Agreement reflects the notes on this page. In addition, those outcomes that were removed from the goals and outcomes section of the stakeholder document because concerns were identified by one or more members, were later identified as potential gaps.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Issue/comment Raised** | **Status of Stakeholder Review Abridged outline for 7/3/13 availability** | **Discuss/resolve at 7/11 MB mtg** |
| CBC and others: Management Strategies, when developed, should be presented to the PSC. | No change | Yes |
| CBC - Should new/revised outcomes be signed off on by the EC? | No change | No, PSC already acted on this. |
| LGAC, CAC, others: Stakeholder Review too short | No change | Yes. Proposal to extend review of full draft to 30 days. **New proposed timeline is attached** |
| PA and others - Cross check all outcomes to ensure consistency with each other and with WIPS/TMDL. Need to harmonize all agreements, including TMDL/WIPs, EO, and CBP Agreements | No change | Drafters need to cross check the complete draft document to ensure consistency throughout |
| CBC- Incorporate cost-minimization/effectiveness into the Bay agreement preamble, principles and operation commitment language (see below for specific draft language under each sections) | No change | MB to consider |
| **Preamble** | | |
| CBC suggested language: We recognize that there are substantial costs to achieving a clean Bay, and that ultimately those costs are borne by our individual citizens. We are committed to ensuring that the necessary actions which follow can be carried out at the least possible cost to individuals and society. | No change | Drafters to consider. |
| LGAC: Suggest revising 2nd to last paragraph to read: This agreement also acknowledges the reality that the partnership cannot address every issue at once. Rather, we must progress in a strategic manner, focusing on efforts that will achieve to greatest results, including enabling, empowering and facilitating local governments and other stakeholders to assist in the effort. | No change | Drafters to consider |
| WV, NY, VA, others: Add language to preamble to clarify what the signatories are specifically signing up for. | Add caveat language | Draft language is currently being developed for consideration by the MB. |
| **Vision/Mission** | | |
| LGAC – Last bullet in vision should be split into 2 bullets:   * Local governments, businesses, schools and universities, watershed organizations, neighborhoods, and individuals committed to impleneting actions that will achieve the goals and outcomes of this agreement; and * Vibrant sustainable communities | No Change | Drafters to consider |
| **Goals and Outcomes** | | |
| **Sustainable Fisheries goal/outcomes** | | |
| * No comments on overarching goal | No change | No |
| * Crab outcome | No change | CBC suggested adding a commitment to explore catch or total effort allocations and recognize that this is an approach that will address outstanding latent fishing efforts |
| * Oyster Outcome – proposed 10? tributaries | Work with VA to get ok to release for stakeholder input for 10 tributaries. Alternative, keep blank for number of tribs but no change to remaining language | Consider right number of tributaries. VA reported concern for 10 tributaries, ACE voiced support. |
| * Oyster Outcome – modify language to capture metrics that have been developed | No change | Drafters to consider |
| * Forage fish | Not included. No specific language has been presented yet. | VA expressed concern with forage fish outcome. CBC supports and suggests CBF recommended language as a start |
| * Habitat – no specific outcome language. Issue – is the Habitat goal and outcomes sufficient? | Not included. No specific language has been offered. | Discussion on making sure that the habitat goal and outcomes are sufficient to meet GIT 1 needs. |
| **Habitat goals/outcomes** | | |
| * No comments on overarching goal | No change | No |
| * Wetlands outcome – GIT suggestion for 75,000 acres | Accept change | No issue raised for resolution |
| * Black Duck | No change | No issue raised for resolution |
| * Stream health | No change | PA- Cross check with TMDL/WIPs |
| * Brook Trout | No change | WV – already have active programs in place. Don’t be duplicative. |
| * Fish Passage – new GIT language: . . . presence of Alewife, Blueback herring, American shad, Hickory shad, American eel and/or Brook Trout | Accept new language | No issue raised for resolution |
| * SAV – new GIT language: Achieve and sustain the ultimate outcome of 185,000 acres of SAV Bay-wide. This will be demonstrated by having xx% of Bay segments achieving and sustaining their segment acreage targets for SAV by 2025 | Accept new language | VA/WQ GIT chair - Align with water quality goal |
| * Forestry – 1,000 acres per year in 120 communities – PA requests clarifying that it is not 1,000 acres per year in each of the 120 communities | Clarify to say: 1,000 acres per year in a total of 120 communities. | Drafters to consider |
| **Water quality goals and outcomes** | | |
| * LGAC recommended changing “while protecting human health” to “and protect human health” | Accept new language | Drafters to consider |
| * 2017 outcome | No change | No issue raised for resolution |
| * CBC- Add data management under 2017 outcome: Improve practice data collection, verification and transparency by 2015 for the most commonly applied agricultural and urban best management practices in order to provide necessary reasonable assurance of practice implementation and strengthen accuracy and public confidence in reported pollution reductions | No change | MB to consider. |
| * 2025 outcome | No change | No issue raised for resolution |
| * Agricultural Conservation Outcome | Not included | Issue Resolution Committee to consider – supporting removal: WV, VA, PA (if it doesn’t harmonize with existing WIP) |
| * Toxic Contaminant outcomes | Not included | MB and IRC to consider – PA, WV voiced objections. Feds, CAC, MD, DC support |
| * EO goal for 60% of segments meeting water quality standards for DO, Clarity, Chlorophyll a | Not included | WQ GIT did not support. |
| * CBC- include initiative to examine how land conservation could be factored into the TMDL | Not included | IRC will consider |
| **Healthy Watersheds goal and outcome** | | |
| No comments on overarching goal or outcome language, but several comments on the definitions used for “healthy” | No changes | VA, WV, PA Concern about definitions for how “healthy” is defined, how the data were captured, and who was involved in the conversation. GIT 4 is to present info on this at the MB meeting |
| **Land Conservation goal and outcome** | | |
| No suggested changes to language for goal or outcome. Concern for definition of conserved and protected. MD identified a difference between conservation and protection that should be considered. VA concerned about targeting high conservation priority areas. Since most land protection is done on private lands, it is difficult to require that we just consider high priority lands | No changes | Definitions will be available at MB meeting for consideration. |
| **Public Access goal and outcome** | | |
| * No suggested changes to language for goal or outcome. * Issue with definition of public access including view only access. Support for some access sites (e.g. Great Falls) being important as view-only, but concern that the overall ratio of view-only to water access be low. * CAC – Need to identify the amount of overall access sites that would be considered view only. * Suggested solution (GIT 5 chair) – appropriate topic for the management strategies * VA requested definition of “site” | No changes | MB to discuss. Definitions will be available at meeting |
| **Environmental Literacy goals and outcomes** | | |
| * GIT 5 suggested changes to overarching goal language to address earlier VA concerns. * No language was agreed to for goal or outcomes. * PA concerned about goal and outcomes, particularly green buildings, since this is not in education dept’s control. PA does not agree that this should go forward for public review at this time * VA concerned about cost | Not included | MB and IRC will discuss |
| **Other Goals Proposed** |  |  |
| **Stewardship Goal** |  |  |
| * Goal proposed at Management Board meeting * PA, CBC concern with goal because it has no outcomes or measures. * PA also concerned about it being measurable and achievable, particularly with as many local governments as there are in PA. NOAA suggested looking to Puget Sound for ideas of measurable outcomes for this. * DC highly supports it * LGAC recommends the following edits: Add “local” in front of “stewards” and add “, including local government,” after “stewards” * GIT 5 chair suggested addition of a stewardship outcome under each applicable overarching goal. * EPA suggested that it may be more appropriate under operational commitments * VA concerned about capturing too many things under goals/outcomes | Not Included | MB/IRC to discuss |
| **Sound Land Use** |  |  |
| * MD suggested a new goal for sound land use. No specific language provided at this point. Concerned that a lack of such a goal would be perceived backing away from a significant commitment in Chesapeake 2000 and that without sound land use practices we can not meet our other goals * LGAC does not support it as a goal but agrees that it should be addressed in the Agreement. If addressed, it should reflect that land use planning is a local responsibility * VA, PA, WV, NY do not support this goal * CBC suggests that if it can’t go forward as a goal, it should be included as a separate outcome under goals that are impacted by land use decisions (habitat, water quality, healthy watersheds) | Not included | MB/IRC will discuss |
| **Local Leadership goal – Not fully considered by PSC** | | |
| **Engage, empower, and facilitate leadership by local governments and other stakeholders.** | Not included | MB will discuss |
| Outcomes:   * Build capacity of local governments by supporting annual leadership training for local elected officials and senior staff. * Increase communication between state and local governments understand the role they can play in achieving the goals outlined in the Agreement | Not included | MB will discuss |
| **Management Strategy Elements** | | |
| * MD recommended adding to the Agreement language that each jurisdiction/agency will describe roles, and that there is a commitment to stakeholder review |  | MB will discuss |
| **Principles** | | |
| CBC suggested language: Strive to ensure that these goals and outcomes are achieved in a timely way at the least possible cost to our citizens | Not included | MB will discuss |
| CAC requested consideration of Striving for increased public confidence by undergoing independent evaluation | Not included | MB will discuss |
| **Operational Commitments** | | |
| #14 should read “barriers to implementation” rather than “accelerating implementation” | Not included | PSC agreed, no discussion is necessary. Drafters will make change. |