



Chesapeake Bay Program
Science. Restoration. Partnership.

**Management Board Meeting
August 15, 2018
Actions/Decisions**

Actions from the “Healthy Watersheds” Quarterly Progress Meeting

Responsible party highlighted in blue.

Request	Agreed Partner action	Due date
Healthy Watersheds		
Renewed engagement of HWGIT members	The Healthy Watersheds workgroup will provide the Management Board with a list of which partners are participating in the workgroup.	2 weeks prior to Sept. MB (Sept. 5)
Improved Coordination and Collaboration among GITs and workgroups	<i>Common request</i>	
Ensure that related and/or dependent cross-GIT priorities are addressed within the CBP	<i>Common request</i>	
Share key information with stakeholders: Communicate results of data, maps, assessment and vulnerability information, messages, and land use policies, incentives and planning tools.	<i>Common request</i>	

Request	Agreed Partner action	Due date
Protected Lands		
Invest in engaging new generation of conservationists	<i>Common request</i>	
Sustain and grow public financing for land conservation and facilitate new sources of financing	The Protected Lands outcome will participate in the SRS Financing Forum.	
Fund science and research on trends influencing land protection	<p>The Protected Lands outcome will collaborate with the Modeling Workgroup's efforts on climate change, water quality trends, and whether land use modeling can inform the loss of habitat. The Protected Lands outcome will also collaborate with USGS on mapping source water protection zones and shallow and deep-water drinking aquifers that are at risk from groundwater contamination. Mapping will be completed in MD and then other watershed jurisdictions.</p> <p>The Protected Lands outcome will pursue, with assistance from the Management Board, the FEMA authorization and funds that promote land conservation as a flood mitigation tool under FEMA's Community Rating System for flood vulnerable communities in the Bay watershed and map the undeveloped parcels within these communities that could protect source water and should be considered for permanent protection. The workgroup requests that a Management Board member volunteer to help facilitate the conversation with FEMA.</p> <p>What is the current status of watershed information on the tradeoffs between the building sites of solar panels? The CBPO GIS team could conduct a mapping exercise to see where brownfields, median strips or rooftops could be used to site solar fields rather than on conserved lands. This exercise could also be one of the deliverable products from the Chesapeake Conservancy's cross-GIT mapping contract.</p>	<p>Update at Sept. 19 MB meeting</p> <p>MB member volunteer by the Sept. 19 meeting *Ann Swanson (CBC) volunteered.</p> <p>Update at Sept. 19 MB meeting</p>
Stream Health		
Support for BIBI Data call for 2012-2017	Workgroup will return with a list of whom they contacted at each agency and what requested information is missing.	2 weeks prior to Sept. MB (Sept. 5)
Evaluate options and make recommendations for revising the	Workgroup will return to the MB, if they decide to recommend a change to the outcome.	

Request	Agreed Partner action	Due date
outcome (change 10% of stream miles to 10% of CB watershed)		
UMCES intern support for stressor white paper	USGS can support a staff person to write the white paper. Workgroup and USGS will meet to determine the project details.	Update at December MB meeting (next follow-up meeting)
Ensure active participation from all jurisdictions	Workgroup will share a list of their current membership with GIT 6. GIT 6 will help the workgroup with their membership structure.	2 weeks prior to Sept. MB (Sept. 5)
Limit and simplify workgroup reporting to focus on implementing logic and action plan	Workgroup will work with their Habitat GIT coordinator/staffers and GIT 6/SRS support team.	
Brook Trout		
CBPO/other staff support to help develop communication/outreach plan, identify key decision-makers	<i>Common request</i>	
Increase funding for both monitoring and travel support within the agencies represented on the workgroup:	MB will need to determine if it is worth the investment to increase monitoring frequency. The workgroup will incorporate the steps necessary to answer this question into their logic and action plan and will return to the MB with more information to help this decision (likely dependent upon the 2020 data).	2020
CBP staff support to help develop and maintain tracking spreadsheet/tool	CBPO staff will determine if this is feasible within current CBP data tracking tools.	Update at Sept. MB meeting
Fish Habitat		
WIP engagement opportunities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluate success of BMP fact sheets Identify timelines and key points of contact 	Short term: Lewis Linker (EPA) and Sean Corson (NOAA) will meet to use current Phase III Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP) implementation information in the input decks to identify where the Fish Habitat co-benefit fact sheet was used in the WIPs. Based on the success of the fish habitat pilot, MB members will decide whether to pursue the same exercise with the other eleven outcomes that requested inclusion in the Phase III WIPs.	Update at Sept. MB meeting

Request	Agreed Partner action	Due date
	<p>Long term: CBP modeling team could conduct a fine scale gap analysis and return to MB with some prototypes on how to identify where the WIPS used the twelve co-benefit fact sheets.</p> <p>Potential opportunities with data dashboard/cross GIT-mapping.</p>	2020
<p>Setting shoreline hardening limits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use shoreline threshold results to recommend shoreline hardening limits and provide guidance to planning and policy • Move from research to application in preventing further shoreline hardening 	<p>There are a few recent GIT Funding projects that address land owner attitudes toward living shorelines. These GIT Funding project leads will keep the Fish Habitat Action Team informed of their progress.</p> <p>The CBPO GIS team could conduct a mapping exercise to identify target areas for shoreline restoration. Based on this exercise and the GIT Funding projects, Management Board members could share information on softening shorelines to state and local representatives.</p>	Update at December MB meeting (next follow-up meeting)
Fish Passage		
Changing the outcome	Mary Andrews (NOAA) will share a rough estimate of current stream miles based on the old calculation methods. Due to scheduling conflicts, MB members will decide at the October 17 MB meeting if they will recommend changing the goal to the PSC.	2 weeks prior to Oct. MB (Oct. 3)
<p>Bring awareness to dam safety programs that dam removal is a viable option to consider along with the usual “repair or replace” options under dam safety regulations and planning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PA – excellent job! Model coordination • MD – stalled with new leadership pending at DNR and MDE. Need 	Identify action items during the October 17 MB meeting.	

Request	Agreed Partner action	Due date
renewed emphasis on these talks. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> VA – staff from dam safety to attend VA Fish Passage Task Force Meetings 		
Common requests		
Increased collaboration between “sister” outcomes to help with awareness, timing and capacity	The October 29 GIT Chairs meeting will be dedicated to identifying ways to increase collaboration between outcomes, focusing first on the Stream Health and Fish Habitat outcomes. For example, outcomes in the Healthy Watersheds SRS cohort could commit to specifically including cross-outcome meetings in their revised logic and action plans.	Return to MB in Dec./Jan.
Outcome connection to local leadership engagement	Identify action items during the September 19 MB meeting.	

Business Meeting

- Decision: The Management Board agreed to request that the Water Quality GIT assess options on updating the milestone guide. The Water Quality GIT will then bring these options back to the MB for a decision.