**Citizens Advisory Committee Comments on the draft GIT Goal Statements September 2012**

The Citizens Advisory Committee spent time at their September 6-7, 2012 quarterly meeting to review and discuss the Goal Implementation Team’s goal statements in order to better understand the goals the Bay Program are pursing and to be prepared to offer comments as the Management Board engages in the discussion of the goals and future of the Program. CAC used the Preliminary GIT Goals Statements dated 6-12-12 and the presentation slides presented by the GIT chairs to the Management Board on August 2, 2012 as their primary references.

**General statements and observations about the goals:**

* Some of the goal statements seem to be strategies or tools (like nutrient trading) instead of measurable goals.
* There should be more focus on prevention and measuring existing healthy resources that we need to keep versus fixing pollution or degradation after the fact (for example, forest buffers, undeveloped lands, etc…).
* The human element is missing.  Human habitats like urban communities and how human activities fit into the process is not addressed.
* Toxics and contaminants goals are missing.
* The goals should go beyond structural impediments imposed by the organizational chart. There should be better connectivity and communication between GITs when they are related or shared goals.
* Where are the opportunities to set goals for emerging issues?
* It is not always clear who is accountable for meeting some of the goals and if there are any consequences if they are not met.
* Where are the NAS Independent Evaluation recommendations and what role does an Independent Evaluator have in the goal attainment process?

Below are the questions the CAC members were given to discuss in small groups. The group’s answers were reported to the full CAC after the break-out session.

1. Are the Goal Implementation Team’s goal statements clear and concise? If not, which one(s) are unclear?

Sustainable Fisheries:

Some of the goals are process oriented, like goal # 3 (coalition building, information sharing and coordination).

Protect and Restore Vital Habitats:

* Goal # 8 seems to be more of a mission statement that a goal statement. It is hard to measure when this is completed. It would be helpful to know the link between miles and acreage and the goals. For example: why was 30,000 acres of wetlands chosen in Goal 12? What is the relationship between the acreage and a restored habitat?
* Where is the human element like human land habitats, especially urban communities?
* It is hard to understand the difference between the work of Restore and Protect Habitat and Maintain Healthy Watershed GITs.

Protect and Restore Water Quality:

* Goal # 13 TMDL: no comments because it seems the TMDL is the preeminent goal of the Bay Program right now
* #14 Accelerated Agricultural Practices - Important goal; requires a tiered approach. Targeting is often hard in this area and needs addressing by federal and state agencies as well as soil and water districts.
* # 15 Urban Stormwater – focus of this is retrofits on developed lands. Important since this is the major load that is increasing. This goal statement, however, leaves out new construction activities on undeveloped lands which contribute to stormwater runoff. This needs to be added. Often, barriers exist to using new technologies for stormwater management which need to be removed or reduced to allow for adaptive management for stormwater practices. The E.O. focus on federal highway projects while laudable is incomplete.
* # 16 Wastewater Treatment – this goal is mostly on track.
* #17 Nutrient Trading – focus on restoring water quality is a critical element to use of trading (and offsets) in the TMDL context. The goal statement needs to be turned around so that it starts with restoring water quality through careful trading that is also protective of local water quality. Nutrient trading can be one tool. That said, the group also wondered if this goal statement belonged here since it is more of a tactic than a goal.
* # 18 Measuring Progress – we thought this was clearly a tactic and did not belong as a goal.
* #19 BMP Effectiveness – We believe there is a “credibility gap” with regard to BMP accounting, verifiability, and effectiveness. This was recently pointed out by the National Research Council report (May 2011). The key to this goal needs to be stated to provide greater certainty of what BMPs are achieving.
* #20 Forestry – The proposed goal statement is unclear. We prefer the E.O. goal language instead. Also, we believe the accounting should include “net” gain since some forest buffers installed in the past are no longer functioning or have been removed.

Healthy Watersheds:

* #21 is vague and not easily measured. #22 and #23 are statements of what the GIT is doing rather than a goal. The GIT goal statements are less clear than the goals outlined in C2K and the Executive Order. There are no timelines and it is hard to know when the goals will be met.
* It is hard to understand the difference between the work of Restore and Protect Habitat and Maintain Healthy Watershed GITs.

Foster Chesapeake Stewardship:

Only Goal #28 seemed to be concise and measurable. There is a question as to why points of access are counted rather than miles of access.

1. Is it clear who is accountable for achieving the goals and outcomes? Are the right parties accountable or are there others that should be included?

Sustainable Fisheries:

The group asked if the PA Fish and Boat Commission is involved in this GIT.

Protect and Restore Vital Habitats:

* It seems clear on the CBP organizational chart who is chairing the group toward the goals, but is there a single agency or organization that is accountable for them?
* Are there any consequences to an agency if the habitat goals are not met?

Protect and Restore Water Quality:

No specific comment, other than the one on the TMDL above, on this question from this group.

Healthy Watersheds:

* It is not very clear exactly what or how the GIT is achieving its goals, so it is difficult to know who is accountable for them.
* What are the main differences in the work of GIT 2 and GIT 4?
* Are the Soil Conservation Commissions involved?

Foster Chesapeake Stewardship:

It seems the National Park Service is responsible for the goals, but there is a question why the Department of Education is not also responsible since they are the experts in education.

1. Are there goals that should be included in the partnership effort that are not listed? (They may be from Chesapeake 2000 Agreement / previous Executive Council Directives or emerging issues the partnership should address.) If so, what are they?

Sustainable Fisheries:

Considerations to emerging threats to fisheries including endocrine disruptors, new invasive species and impacts of climate change.

Protect and Restore Vital Habitats:

* Perhaps there are too many “goals” for this GIT, but not enough on maintaining existing habitats.
* Why are there Two-Year Milestones only for water quality?

Protect and Restore Water Quality:

* Toxics/Chemical contaminants
* Air Quality impacts on water quality
* New Construction stormwater impacts from undeveloped lands
* Conowingo Dam pending problem with sediment trapping capacity
* Pollution Prevention should be incorporated into each goal as a strategic opportunity
* Also, some thought acid mine drainage and drilling issues belonged in the water quality section

Healthy Watersheds:

* Some members felt natural gas drilling impacts, abandoned mine lands, and climate change are issues that should be addressed in this GIT.
* Having a benchmark of a “Fair” stream is unacceptable.

Foster Chesapeake Stewardship:

* There does not seem to be anything about targeting adult education or changing behavior.
* Where is the element of cultural relevance and outreach to minority communities?
* Where is the Meaningful Watershed Environmental Education goal?
1. Are there goals that should *not* be collectively pursued because they are not as crucial or do not necessarily need the full partnership to achieve them? If so, what are they?

Sustainable Fisheries:

Perhaps the ones that are process descriptions and not measurable goals

Protect and Restore Vital Habitats:

No, all the goals should be pursued.

Protect and Restore Water Quality:

Monitoring progress should be incorporated, but not necessarily as a goal.

Healthy Watersheds:

Unsure if the goals listed are measurable goals.

Foster Chesapeake Stewardship:

The group felt all the goals on the list are crucial.

1. Was it easy to find the data on specific goals you wanted to learn progress? What source did you use? (Track Progress, Bay Barometer, Chesapeake STAT, or others)

Sustainable Fisheries:

Chesapeake STAT had very good information on Blue Crabs. The links to oysters, menhaden, striped bass and shad were not working that day.

Protect and Restore Vital Habitats:

This group looked at Chesapeake STAT for habitat information and felt it is OK, but maybe a little too technical.

Protect and Restore Water Quality:

This group did not look online for progress.

Healthy Watersheds:

* Chesapeake STAT seems clear on data on forest buffers in miles, but the graph doesn’t indicate whether the progress is ahead or behind schedule of a goal.
* The information about sub-watershed health (species sampling, land protections and management plans) is clear.

Foster Chesapeake Stewardship:

No comments on this question from this group.

1. Should the Bay Program partners sign a new Chesapeake Bay Agreement? Why or why not?
* It would seem the partners could amend the Bay Agreement to reflect new science we have and update the targets and goals with 2025 deadlines.
* Perhaps to mark the 30th Anniversary of the first Chesapeake Agreement in1983, but the agreement might focus more on “mission” than have a long list of goals.
* Some felt the political climate may not be good right now to get robust action behind a new agreement, so updating C2K may be the best way forward.
* Is an agreement needed to satisfy the Bay Program section of the Clean Water Act?
* A fundamental question is whether a new Agreement is needed or helpful to implement the Executive Order.
* The Executive Order may not be permanent. A new Administration could eliminate it or ignore it, so it would seem a new agreement would make Bay watershed restoration less dependent on the White House.