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 **TO: Joe Gill, Secretary MD DNR and Chairman, PSC**

**PSC Members**

**FROM: Ann Swanson, Executive Director Chesapeake Bay Commission
 on behalf of Commission members**

**DATE: May 19, 2014**

**RE: Bay Agreement follow-up requested by CBC members at May 8-9, 2014 meeting**

Thank you again for participating in the Chesapeake Bay Commission’s discussion of the draft 2014 Chesapeake Bay Agreement. Below please find the list of issues raised by our members. I ask that you share these comments with the members of the PSC and make time on the conference calls scheduled to give each suggestion its due consideration.

1. The Bay Program should create a companion document to the new Agreement that explains to the public the basis for the goals and outcomes, specifically, the numeric part of the goals and dates. A Q&A as developed as a companion document to *Chesapeake 2000* that can at least be instructive to this effort.
2. The Bay Agreement introduction and narrative language should strengthen focus on rivers, especially since we are bringing in the headwater states to this Agreement  (see rivers declaration for ideas) . Also, the Agreement should be edited for consistency in its reference to the Bay Watershed throughout the document.
3. Considering the large part agriculture plays in both the inputs of nutrients and the implementation of BMP’s to reduce nutrient flow to the Bay, there should be some mention of agriculture as a key partner in the new Agreement, possibly in the preamble or in the stewardship section.   Also, businesses are not mentioned in the stewardship section, but are mentioned in the 4th paragraph of the preamble as key partners. To be consistent, businesses should be mentioned in both sections.
4. Diversity:
	1. Change Stewardship Goal statement to read:  “~~Increase the number and~~ Encourage diversity of . . .”
	2. Change Diversity Outcome to read:  “. . . in the leadership~~, decision making~~ and implementation of ~~the current~~ conservation and . . .” to clarify that we are seeking diversity across the conservation community, and not just within the Bay Program.
5. Environmental Literacy Planning Outcome:

There was a concern that the current language would be viewed by school s a mandate, even though the entire Agreement is voluntary. To avoid this confusion, CBC members suggested schools change the “will” to “should” in this outcome language:

* 1. Each Participating Bay Jurisdiction ~~will~~ SHOULD develop a comprehensive and systemic approach to environmental literacy for all ~~graduates~~ STUDENTS that ~~should~~ includeS policies, practices and voluntary metrics that ~~measure~~ SUPPORT the ENVIRONMENTAL LITERACY GOAL AND outcomes ~~and goal~~ of this agreement.
	2. Should there be goal or outcome language along the lines of, "Continually encourage and maximize the participation of environmental and education related NGOs in achieving environmental literacy goals?"
1. The order of Goals should be revised to improve flow of the document.  Grouping “Resiliency, Land Conservation and Healthy Watersheds” is logical, as is “Stewardship, Public Access, and Environmental Literacy.” Our suggested order is:

Sustainable Fisheries

Vital Habitats

Water Quality

Toxic Contaminants
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Land Conservation

Stewardship

Public Access

Environmental Literacy