Public Comments Addressed by Goal Implementation Teams or Issues Resolution Committee

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Issue and IRC Leads** | **Issue Detail** | **IRC or GIT Recommendations** |
| **1. Explanation of numeric goals, outcomes and baselines** | Explanation needed for how numeric goals, outcomes and baselines were developed (including net increase issue). Assignment: Communications Workgroup/GITs | **The IRC recommends that a public document associated with the agreement be released in tandem, but explanation should not be included within agreement. Changes will be addressed in final response to comments document.** |
| **2. STAC comments**  | Note: GITs should consider potential revisions to their outcomes based on STAC recommendations if possible at this stage, and consider STAC’s recommendations in developing the Management Strategies.Assignment: Goal Implementation TeamsFisheries (GIT 1): Incorporate STAC’s suggestion to the Blue Crab Abundance Outcome. Other recommendations are better for the Management Strategies and will not be used in the outcome statements.Habitats (GIT 2): Incorporate partial STAC suggestions in the SAV outcome and the Black Duck sub-outcome. Other recommendations will be incorporated in the management strategies, but will not be used in outcomes.Healthy Watersheds (GIT 4): STAC’s recommendations fit better in the management strategies, and will not be used in the outcome.Protected Lands (GIT 5): STAC’s recommendations reduce the outcome to water quality and habitat, going against the broader goal language, and will not be used in the outcome.Land Use (CBC): Incorporate STAC’s suggestions.Public Access (GIT 5): Continually increasing public access is not appropriate. STAC’s recommendations will not be used in the outcome.Environmental Literacy (GIT 5): Incorporate STAC’s suggestions.Toxics (Adhoc Team): Incorporate STAC’s suggestions.Climate Change (MD): Incorporate STAC’s suggestions. | **See Recommended Response to STAC comments. If IRC or GITs recommend including STAC language, it is incorporated in outcomes for PSC consideration, unless otherwise noted.**  |
| **3. Public Access Goal & Outcome**  | a. Increase the number of sites b. Recognize private partners Assignment: GIT 5-------------------------**Goal**: Expand public access to the Bay and its tributaries through existing and new local, state and federal parks, refuges, reserves, trails and partner sites.**Public Access Site Development Outcome**: By 2025, add 300 new public-access sites, with a strong emphasis on providing opportunities for boating, swimming and fishing, where feasible. (2010baseline year) | GIT 5 is comfortable with the status quo: Partner sites are already recognized in the goal statement and are explicitly incorporated in the process for counting, tracking and adding new sites. |
| **4. Fish Passage Outcome** | Highlight dam removals and focus on hydro-electric dams Assignment: GIT 2 | GIT2 recommends addressing this in the Management Strategies. No change to the Agrmt. recommended. |
| **5. Forage Fish Outcome** | Management should follow study resultsAssignment: GIT 1 | Status quo. No change to Agrmt. recommended from GIT |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **6. Trash** | Champion: D.C. & Md. Refer to citizen stewardship group & water quality sections | **The IRC recommends addressing trash in the Stewardship Management Strategy.** |
| **7. Funding/Financing** | * 1. Emphasize technical/funding assistance to local governments
 | a) Already addressed in current draft. PSC previously decided to not include financial assistance in the agrmt. |
| * 1. Integrated affordability concepts into management strategies
 | **The IRC recommends the status quo: it is already addressed.** |
| * 1. Comments on entrepreneurship and ecosystem markets
 | d) Lead: CBC will propose language by 4/21/14**No IRC consensus recommendation on concept**. |
| **8. Accountability/ Verification/Independent Evaluation**  | Assignment: GIT 6, IRC | Already addressed in the Preamble and Principles. |
| **9. Numerous comments on Principles**  | Numerous comments on Principles to be considered by IRC and Editorial BoardAssignment (text): Editorial Board Assignment (policy): IRC | **Editorial Board is currently working on these (4/23/14).** |