

Goals and Outcomes Comment Summary, Resolutions, and Revisions

Note: “**CHANGED**” denotes a change in language from the Agreement draft circulated for the 7-11-13 Management Board retreat.

SUSTAINABLE FISHERIES GOAL AND OUTCOMES (GIT 1)

SUSTAINABLE FISHERIES GOAL – CHANGED

Goal as of 7-11-13

Sustainable Fisheries Goal: Restore, enhance, and protect the finfish, shellfish and other living resources, their habitats and ecological relationships to sustain all fisheries and provide for a balanced ecosystem in the watershed and bay.

Comment Summary

The Principals’ Staff Committee approved the goal at their June 27th meeting with a decision to move “protect” to the beginning of the goal language.

Updated Goal 8-16-13

Sustainable Fisheries Goal: **Protect**, restore, and ~~protect~~ **enhance** the finfish, shellfish and other living resources, their habitats and ecological relationships to sustain all fisheries and provide for a balanced ecosystem in the watershed and bay.

Editorial Board “public friendly” Agreement Version

Sustainable Fisheries Goal: Protect, restore, and enhance ~~the~~ finfish, shellfish and other living resources, their habitats and ecological relationships to sustain all fisheries and provide for a balanced ecosystem in the watershed and bay.

BLUE CRAB OUTCOME – CHANGED

Outcome as of 7-11-13

Blue Crab Outcome: Maintain sustainable blue crab population based on the current 2012 target of 215 million adult females (1+ years old) and continue to refine population targets between 2013 through 2025 based on best available science.

Comment Summary

Add Bay-wide annual catch limits to give predictability to fishermen, have an allocation of the catch limit among the jurisdictions, and implement accountable monitoring of all harvest.

Team Resolution

The Fisheries Goal Implementation Team (GIT 1) reached consensus on CBC’s proposed outcome language (with a few minor changes) for evaluating a Bay-wide allocation management framework and improving harvest accountability.

Updated Outcomes 8-16-13

Blue Crab Abundance Outcome: Maintain sustainable blue crab population based on the current 2012 target of 215 million adult females (1+ years old) and continue to refine population targets between 2013 through 2025 based on best available science.

Blue Crab Management Outcome: **Improve our ability to manage for a stable and productive crab population and fishery by working with the industry, recreational crabbers, and other stakeholders to improve commercial and recreational harvest accountability and evaluate the establishment of a Bay-**

wide allocation-based management framework with annual levels set by the jurisdictions that will provide stability for crabbing businesses and accountability of the harvest for each jurisdiction.

Editorial Board “public friendly” Agreement Version

Blue Crab Abundance Outcome: Maintain a sustainable blue crab population based on the current 2012 target of 215 million adult females (~~1+ years old~~) and continue to refine population targets ~~between 2013~~ through 2025 based on best available science.

Blue Crab Management Outcome: Improve ~~our~~ the ability to manage for a stable and productive crab population and fishery by working with the industry, recreational crabbers, and other stakeholders to improve commercial and recreational harvest accountability. ~~and~~ Evaluate the establishment of a Bay-wide, allocation-based management framework with annual levels set by the jurisdictions that will provide stability for crabbing businesses and accountability of the harvest for each jurisdiction.

OYSTER OUTCOME – CHANGED

Outcome as of 7-11-13

Oyster Outcome: Restore native oyster habitat and populations in ____ tributaries by 2025.

Comment Summary

Several jurisdictions were concerned that the original number of tributaries to restore was overly ambitious, and the Management Board directed the Fisheries Goal Implementation Team (GIT 1) to capture metrics that have been developed. Stakeholders expressed similar requests to include metrics, and requested the outcome include public & private fisheries as well as ecosystem services.

Team Resolution

There is consensus to state the intent of restoration as ecological benefits of healthy oyster reefs, but not to reference the oyster fishery because the intent of restoration is ecosystem services.

There is consensus on an outcome of restoring 10 tributaries by 2025.

The oyster metrics will be included in the Management Strategy section as they guide the restoration planning process.

Jurisdictions are considering the resources needed for restoration in setting a target for 2025. This outcome is not the end of oyster restoration, just a target for the next 10 years.

Updated Outcome 8-16-13

Oyster Outcome: Restore native oyster habitat and populations in 10 tributaries by 2025 to recover the benefits of fish habitat and water quality improvements provided by healthy oyster reefs.

Editorial Board “public friendly” Agreement Version

Oyster Outcome: Restore native oyster habitat and populations in 10 tributaries by 2025 to recover the benefits of fish habitat and water quality improvements ~~provided by that~~ healthy oyster reefs ~~provide~~.

FORAGE FISH OUTCOME – NEW

Outcome as of 7-11-13

No outcome developed at this time.

Comment Summary

The Chesapeake Bay Foundation recommended the adoption of a forage fish outcome to maintain cumulative forage potential for predatory species that support commercial and recreational fisheries. The Chesapeake Bay Commission supported The Chesapeake Bay Foundation’s suggested language.

Some stakeholders recommended outcomes for specific forage species, such as Menhaden.

Team Resolution

There is currently no consensus around a Menhaden goal but the goal team does recognize the importance of all forage fish species in the Bay.

The Fisheries Goal Implementation Team (GIT 1) Executive Committee reached agreement on the following outcome language: “By 2016 develop a strategy for assessing the forage base available for predatory species in Chesapeake Bay.”

Updated Outcome 8-16-13

By 2016 develop a strategy for assessing the forage base available for predatory species in Chesapeake Bay.

Editorial Board “public friendly” Agreement Version

Forage Fish Outcome: By 2016 develop a strategy for assessing the forage (or prey) fish base available as food for predatory species in the Chesapeake Bay.

HABITAT OUTCOME – NEW

Outcome as of 7-11-13

No outcome developed at this time.

Comment Summary

The Management Board and stakeholders questioned whether a Habitat Outcome should be housed under the Fisheries Goal or if the outcomes under the Vital Habitats Goal regarding fish habitat should remain.

Team Resolution

The Fisheries Goal Implementation Team (GIT 1) Executive Committee agreed on language for a habitat outcome to identify critical spawning, nursery, and forage habitat for important fish and shellfish species and to integrate this information to inform restoration and conservation efforts.

Updated Outcome 8-16-13

During the period 2014-2025, continue to identify and characterize critical spawning, nursery and forage areas within the Bay and [tidal]* tributaries for important fish and shellfish and utilize new tools to integrate information and conduct assessments to inform restoration and conservation efforts.

*Note: The brackets indicate that the word “tidal” remains undecided.

Editorial Board “public friendly” Agreement Version

Habitat Outcome: ~~During the period 2014-2025,~~ Continue to identify and characterize critical spawning, nursery and forage areas within the Bay and [tidal] tributaries for important fish and shellfish and ~~utilize~~ use new tools to integrate information and conduct assessments to inform restoration and conservation efforts.

SUGGESTED INVASIVE SPECIES OUTCOME – NO CHANGE

Comment Summary

There was a stakeholder request to address responsiveness to invasive species.

Team Resolution

There is no consensus among the Fisheries Goal Implementation Team (GIT 1) to include an invasive species outcome.

VITAL HABITATS GOAL AND OUTCOMES (GIT 2)

VITAL HABITATS GOAL – NO CHANGE

Goal as of 7-11-13

Vital Habitats Goal: Restore, enhance, and protect a network of land and water habitats to support priority species and to afford other public benefits, including water quality, recreational uses and scenic value across the watershed.

Comment Summary

An explanation is needed for the differences between existing WIPs and agreement outcomes – the Management board directed the Vital Habitats Goal Team to develop and Q & A related to this.

Any vegetation used in restoration projects should be native.

Team Resolution

Language was developed to explain the differences between WIPs and agreement outcomes and was sent to appropriate workgroups for comments:

“Goal was based on a compromise between past performance (as a measure of feasible implementation rate given current funding levels), the need to meet necessary state WIP targets, and the option to re-visit the goal in 2017 as WIPS are updated.”

Native vegetation will likely be included in Management Strategies.

Editorial Board “public friendly” Agreement Version

Vital Habitats Goal: Restore, enhance, and protect a network of land and water habitats to support **high**-priority species and to afford other public benefits, including water quality, recreational uses and scenic value across the watershed.

WETLANDS OUTCOME / BLACK DUCK SUB-OUTCOME – CHANGED

Outcome as of 7-11-13

Wetlands Outcome: Restore a total of 75,000 acres of tidal and non-tidal wetlands, primarily on resource and agricultural lands, and enhance function of an additional 150,000 acres of degraded wetlands.

Black Duck: Restore wetland habitats to support a wintering black duck population in the watershed of 100,000 birds by 2025.

Comment Summary

A deadline date is needed, and protecting upland wetlands from sprawl should be specific.

Team Resolution

Will add 2025 deadline to wetland outcomes and the acreage goal will be re-assessed in 2017 based on state Phase III WIP targets.

Protection of wetlands is included in land conservation; no need to duplicate in Habitats Outcomes.

Updated Outcome 8-16-13

Wetlands Outcome: **Create or re-establish 85,000** ~~Restore a total of 75,000~~ acres of tidal and non-tidal wetlands ~~primarily on resource and agricultural lands~~, and enhance function of an additional 150,000 acres of degraded wetlands **by 2025. These activities may occur in any land use including urban but primarily occur in agricultural or natural landscapes.**

Black Duck: Restore wetland habitats to support a wintering black duck population in the watershed of 100,000 birds by 2025.

Editorial Board “public friendly” Agreement Version

No change.

STREAM HEALTH OUTCOME / BROOK TROUT SUB-OUTCOME – NO CHANGE

Outcome as of 7-11-13

Stream Health Outcome: Restore stream health and function by 10% above the 2008 level* throughout the watershed by 2025. *Note: Baseline will be re-assessed

Brook Trout: Restore naturally reproducing brook trout populations with an 8% increase in total cumulative brook trout patch area by 2025 in Chesapeake headwater streams.

Comment Summary

Avoid duplicating state brook trout programs

Support for 8% population increase, but also protect existing populations.

Some Chesapeake Bay Program partners and public stakeholders felt the brook trout outcome was better suited under the Fisheries Goal.

Team Resolution

The 8% increase is strongly supported by the Eastern Brook Trout Joint Venture, and protecting existing populations will be included in Management Strategies.

Brook Trout Outcome will remain under the Habitat Goal. Brook trout acts as an indicator for Stream Health and focuses on habitat issues.

There will be opportunity for the Fisheries and Vital Habitats Goal Implementation Teams (GIT 1 and GIT 2) to collaborate in the Management Strategies for the Brook Trout Outcome.

Editorial Board “public friendly” Agreement Version

Stream Health Outcome: No Change.

Brook Trout: Restore naturally reproducing brook trout populations with an 8% increase in total cumulative brook trout ~~patch~~ **habitat** area by 2025 in Chesapeake headwater streams.

FISH PASSAGE OUTCOME – NO CHANGE

Outcome as of 7-11-13

Fish Passage Outcome: During the period 2011-2025, restore historical fish migratory routes by opening 1,000 additional stream miles, with restoration success indicated by the presence of Alewife, Blueback herring, American shad, Hickory shad, American eel and/or Brook Trout.

Comment Summary

Comments regarding fish passage were largely expressing support for the outcome.

Team Resolution

Details requested for inclusion by stakeholders on achieving the outcome will be included in the Management Strategy.

Editorial Board “public friendly” Agreement Version

Fish Passage Outcome: ~~During the period 2011-2025~~ **By 2025**, restore historical fish migratory routes by opening 1,000 additional stream miles, with restoration success indicated by the presence of Alewife,

Blueback herring, American shad, Hickory shad, American eel and/or Brook Trout. (Tracking from a 2011 baseline year.)

SUBMERGED AQUATIC VEGETATION OUTCOME – CHANGED

Outcome as of 7-11-13

Submerged Aquatic Vegetation Outcome: Achieve and sustain the ultimate outcome of 185,000 acres of SAV Bay-wide. This will be demonstrated by having ___ % of Bay segments achieving and sustaining their segment acreage targets for SAV by 2025

Comment Summary

The Management Board directed the Vital Habitats Goal Implementation Team (GIT 2) to determine the best percentage of segments achieved to align the SAV outcome with the Water Quality Goal.

Some groups felt that the percentage of segments does not necessarily support the 185,000 acre goal and that the two can be exclusive.

Team Resolution

New language was developed to align the outcome with the Water Quality Goal.

Updated Outcome 8-16-13

Submerged Aquatic Vegetation Outcome: Achieve and sustain the ultimate outcome of 185,000 acres of SAV Bay-wide necessary for a restored Bay. Progress towards this ultimate outcome will be measured by achieving 90,000 acres of SAV by 2017 and 130,000 acres by 2025.

Editorial Board “public friendly” Agreement Version

No change.

FORESTRY OUTCOME – CHANGED

Outcome as of 7-11-13

Forestry Outcome: 1) Restore 900 miles per year of riparian forest buffer and conserve buffers until at least 70% of riparian areas are forested, and 2) Expand urban tree canopy by 1,000 acres per year in a total of 120 communities by 2025.

Comment Summary

Some groups felt the metric was unclear, and that a definition of “restored” and “urban tree canopy” was necessary.

Team Resolution

Definition concerns will be resolved through Management Strategies.

The urban tree canopy target was revised based on each state’s contribution.

Updated Outcome 8-22-13

Forestry Outcome: 1) Restore 900 miles per year of riparian forest buffer and conserve buffers until at least 70% of riparian areas are forested, and 2) Expand urban tree canopy by 1,000 acres per year in 120 communities by 2025 by 2,400 acres by 2025.

Editorial Board “public friendly” Agreement Version

Forestry Outcome: 1) Restore 900 miles per year of riparian forest buffer and conserve buffers until at least 70% of riparian areas are forested, and 2) Expand urban tree canopy by 2,400 acres by 2025.

WATER QUALITY GOAL AND OUTCOMES (GIT 3)

WATER QUALITY GOAL – NO CHANGE

Goal as of 7-11-13

Water Quality Goal: Reduce pollutants to achieve the water quality necessary to support the aquatic living resources of the bay and its tributaries and protect human health.

Comment Summary

There were concerns that the timeline for achievement of goals and outcomes with 2017 and 2025 deadlines, are not feasible, and that the dates would limit the need for regulatory flexibility in achieving target allocations.

The factors influencing achievement of the TMDL should be recognized, and the goal should include a commitment to understanding the effectiveness of the WIPs through monitoring and modeling.

The goal should include objectives tied to the Clean Water Act – fishable and swimmable waters.

Storm water should be included specifically.

Team Resolution

Recognizing that change is inevitable over a 15-year period in a dynamic environment like the Bay, and taking into account lag times between the achievement of the 2017 and 2025 target allocation goals, the Bay Agreement does not preclude the possible need for regulatory action in the future. The Partnership is committed to adopting and implementing an adaptive management framework in meeting water quality goals and objectives.

The Chesapeake Bay Program partnership is committed to using the most up to date science and data in its decision making and strategy development processes, taking into account the various stressors affecting Bay health. The partnership is also committed to working closely with stakeholders throughout the watershed in meeting its restoration goals.

The continued measurement of progress in meeting our restoration commitments not only takes into account WIP implementation but the use of monitoring data and our modeling tools for this assessment. The Chesapeake Bay Program partnership is committed to using the most up to date science and data in its decision making and strategy development processes, taking into account the various stressors affecting Bay health, to ensure waters are drinkable, fishable, and swimmable.

The Chesapeake Bay Program partnership recognizes that storm water is a significant contributor to nutrients and sediments entering the Bay and its tributaries. As such, addressing storm water is an integral part of the 2010 Chesapeake Bay Total Maximum Daily Load (Bay TMDL). The Bay jurisdictions have developed Watershed Implementation Plans (WIPs) to meet the target allocations in the Bay TMDL and within these plans; storm water reduction plays a major focus of their water quality improvement projects and programs. The Bay TMDL and WIPs are directly tied to the water quality goals and outcomes found in the draft Bay Agreement.

Editorial Board “public friendly” Agreement Version

No change.

2017 WIP OUTCOME – NO CHANGE

Outcome as of 7-11-13

2017 Watershed Implementation Plans (WIP) Outcome: Have practices and controls in place by 2017 that are expected to achieve 60% of the load reductions necessary to achieve applicable water quality standards compared to 2009 levels.

Comment Summary

Include an outcome for data management.

Team Resolution

See Issues Resolution Committee response to data management request.

Editorial Board “public friendly” Agreement Version

2017 Watershed Implementation Plans (WIP) Outcome: ~~Have practices and controls in place by~~ By 2017, have practices and controls in place that are expected to achieve 60% of the nutrient and sediment pollution load reductions necessary to achieve applicable water quality standards compared to 2009 levels.

2025 WIP OUTCOME – CHANGED

Outcome as of 7-11-13

2025 WIP Outcome: Have all practices and controls installed by 2025 to achieve the Bay’s DO, water clarity/SAV, and chlorophyll a standards.

Comment Summary

The Management Board directed the Water Quality Goal to include a specific mention of the TMDL in the 2025 outcome, and directed the Editorial Board to make sure it is included.

Several stakeholders also requested the inclusion of the TMDL in the Water Quality goal or outcomes.

Team Resolution

TMDL specifically added into outcome.

Updated Outcome 8-16-13

2025 WIP Outcome: Have all practices and controls installed by 2025 to achieve the Bay’s DO, water clarity/SAV, and chlorophyll a standards as articulated in the Chesapeake Bay TMDL.

Editorial Board “public friendly” Agreement Version

2025 WIP Outcome: By 2025, have all practices and controls installed by 2025 to achieve the Bay’s dissolved oxygen, water clarity/submerged aquatic vegetation and chlorophyll a standards as articulated in the Chesapeake Bay Total Maximum Daily Load document.

AGRICULTURAL OUTCOME – NO CHANGE

Outcome as of 7-11-13 – the draft language was included in Appendix A of the draft agreement.

Agricultural Conservation: Work with producers to apply new conservation practices on 4 million acres of agricultural working lands in high priority watersheds by 2025 to improve water quality in the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries

Comment Summary

The Management Board decided to strike the agricultural outcome from the agreement.

Public stakeholders suggested planning for agricultural water supplies, and including farmland as a major factor affecting the watershed.

Team Resolution

The Water Quality Goal Implementation Team (GIT 3) had made previous decisions to exclude sector-specific Goals and Outcomes, and therefore will continue with the Management Board's direction to remove the agricultural outcome.

MAINTAIN HEALTHY WATERSHEDS GOAL AND OUTCOMES (GIT 4)

HEALTHY WATERSHEDS GOAL – CHANGED

Goal as of 7-11-13

Healthy Watersheds Goal: Protect state-identified healthy waters and watersheds recognized for their exceptional quality and high ecological value.

Comment Summary

Emphasize maintain current healthy watersheds and ensure they retain extremely high water quality standards. Don't use the word "protect" as that may confuse this effort with the protection and restoration of impaired waters.

Team Resolution

The Maintain healthy Watersheds Goal implementation team (GIT 4) made a decision to replace "protect" with "sustain" to put emphasis on maintaining currently healthy watersheds rather than restoring impaired watersheds.

Updated Goal 8-16-13

Healthy Watersheds Goal: ~~Protect~~ **Sustain** state-identified healthy waters and watersheds recognized for their exceptional quality and **/or high** ecological value.

Editorial Board "public friendly" Agreement Version

No Change.

HEALTHY WATERSHEDS OUTCOME – NO CHANGE

Outcome as of 7-11-13

Healthy Watersheds Outcome: By 2025 100% of state-identified currently healthy waters and watersheds remain healthy.

Editorial Board "public friendly" Agreement Version

Healthy Waters Outcome: By 2025, 100% of state-identified currently healthy waters and watersheds remain healthy.

FOSTERING CHESAPEAKE STEWARDSHIP GOALS AND OUTCOMES (GIT 5)

LAND CONSERVATION GOAL – NO CHANGE

Goal as of 7-11-13

Land Conservation Goal: Conserve landscapes treasured by citizens to maintain water quality and habitat; sustain working forests, farms and maritime communities; and conserve lands of cultural, indigenous and community value.

Comment Summary

Consider adding a target acreage number to this goal. Tie-in this goal with the currently existing state and multi-state commitments.

Team Resolution / Current Status

No revisions have been made to the goal and outcome currently included in the Draft Agreement.

Goal/outcome will be forward to MB and PRINCIPALS' STAFF COMMITTEE as is.

Editorial Board “public friendly” Agreement Version

No change.

PROTECTED LANDS OUTCOME – NO CHANGE

Goal as of 7-11-13

Protected Lands Outcome: Protect an additional two million acres of lands throughout the watershed currently identified as high conservation priorities at the federal, state or local level by 2025, including 225,000 acres of wetlands and 695,000 acres of forest land of highest value for maintaining water quality (tracking from 2010 baseline year).

Comment Summary

No comments.

Editorial Board “public friendly” Agreement Version

No change.

PUBLIC ACCESS GOAL – NO CHANGE

Goal as of 7-11-13

Public Access 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.

Comment Summary

No comments on the goal.

Editorial Board “public friendly” Agreement Version

No change.

PUBLIC ACCESS SITE DEVELOPMENT OUTCOME – CHANGED

Outcome as of 7-11-13

Public Access Site Development Outcome: Increase public access by adding 300 new public access sites by 2025. (from the 2010 baseline)

Comment Summary

Need to consider how many of the 300 public access sites will be view-only. Should there be a limit set on how many view-only sites will count toward the 300 target?

Team Resolution / Current Status

GIT has worked with partners to revise the outcome. “Increase public access by adding 300 new public access sites by 2025, emphasizing opportunities for water contact (such as boating, swimming and fishing) where feasible (tracking from 2010 baseline year).” Confirmation of acceptance has been received from GIT 5, CAC, and CBC. The revised outcome is available to be forwarded to PRINCIPALS’ STAFF COMMITTEE and MB.

Updated Outcome 8-16-13

Public Access Site Development Outcome: Increase public access by adding 300 new public access sites by 2025, **emphasizing opportunities for water contact (such as boating, swimming, and fishing) where feasible (tracking from 2010 baseline year).**

Editorial Board “public friendly” Agreement Version

Public Access Site Development Outcome: ~~Increase public access by adding~~ Add 300 new public access sites by 2025, emphasizing opportunities for water contact (such as boating, swimming and fishing) where feasible (tracking from the 2010 baseline year).

ENVIRONMENTAL LITERACY GOAL & OUTCOMES – CHANGED

Goal as of 7-11-13 – the draft language was included in Appendix A of the draft agreement.

Environmental Literacy Goal: Every student in the region graduates environmentally literate having participated in teacher supported meaningful watershed educational experiences.

- **Student Outcome:** Increase the number of students participating in meaningful watershed educational experiences in elementary, middle, and high school.
- **Educator Outcome:** Increase the number of teachers receiving sustained professional development to provide and support students’ meaningful watershed educational experiences.
- **School Outcome:** Increase the number of schools in the region maintaining their buildings, grounds, and operations use best practices to support environmental and human health.
- **Local Education Agency Outcome:** Increase the number of local education agencies implementing system wide approaches for environmental education that includes meaningful watershed educational experiences.

Comment Summary

Goal Team Chairs & Maryland preferred environmental literacy be its own goal. PA is concerned about green buildings target. VA & PA had some concerns, including questions about the costs and difficulty of implementation and monitoring, specifically how to define the level of knowledge or experience that is adequate for a student to be considered environmentally literate.

Team Resolution / Current Status

Public and non-governmental organization feedback has identified environmental literacy as an important goal that was not included in the Draft Agreement that was made available for public comment on June 18th. Building off the previously proposed goal and outcomes, GIT 5 has worked with jurisdictions in order to garner support for the inclusion of an environmental literacy goal and outcomes. Revised language has been shared with the jurisdictions and is available to be forwarded to the PRINCIPALS’ STAFF COMMITTEE and MB.

Updated Goal & Outcomes 8-16-13

Every student in the region graduates with the ability to use scientific evidence and citizenships skills to act responsibly to protect and restore their local watershed.

- **Meaningful Watershed Educational Experience Outcome:** Increase the number of students participating in teacher-supported meaningful watershed educational experiences in elementary, middle, and high school.
- **School and School System Model Development Outcome:** Support and highlight models of sustainable schools and local education agencies that use system wide approaches for environmental education.
- **Environmental Literacy Metrics Outcome:** By 2014, develop baseline metrics to establish and measure outcomes related to student participation in teacher supported meaningful watershed educational experiences and related activities.

Editorial Board “public friendly” Agreement Version

Environmental Literacy Goal: Enable every student in the region to graduates with the ability to use scientific evidence and citizenship skills to act responsibly to protect and restore their local watershed.

- **Meaningful Watershed Educational Experience Outcome:** Increase the number of students participating in teacher-supported meaningful watershed educational experiences in elementary, middle and high school.
- **School and School System Model Development Outcome:** The Partnership will support and highlight models of sustainable schools and local education agencies that use system-wide approaches for environmental education.
- **Environmental Literacy Metrics Outcome:** By 2014, develop baseline metrics to establish and measure outcomes related to student participation in teacher supported meaningful watershed educational experiences and related activities.

STEWARDSHIP GOAL – CHANGED

Goal as of 7-11-13 – the draft language was included in Appendix A of the draft agreement.

Stewardship Goal: Promote and support initiatives that increase the number and diversity of stewards who carry out local conservation and restoration to achieve the goals and commitments of the agreement.

Comment Summary

Is a Stewardship Goal measureable and achievable? Some partners are concerned that the Stewardship Goal has no outcomes or measures. NOAA suggested looking at other partnerships such as Puget Sound for ideas on how to develop measureable outcomes for the Stewardship Goal. Belief that a stewardship goal is core to a new agreement and must be included as all CBP actions ultimately fall under a stewardship umbrella.

Team Resolution / Current Status

Through conversations with our partners, GIT 5 has determined that consensus regarding a stand-alone stewardship goal and outcome cannot currently be reached with the jurisdictions. However, support from members of the public and non-governmental organization, received through the public comment period, suggests that stewardship needs to be a key element of the New Agreement. As such, we are proposing stewardship language for inclusion in the New Agreement’s sections on Operational Commitments and Management Strategy Elements. The proposed language is available to be forwarded to the PRINCIPALS’ STAFF COMMITTEE and MB.

Updated Goal 8-16-13

No revised goal recommended.

(See next section.)

STEWARDSHIP - OPERATIONAL COMMITMENTS AND MANAGEMENT STRATEGY ELEMENTS -NEW

GIT 5 is putting forth the following stewardship language for inclusion in the New Agreement's

Operational Commitments:

"Promote and support initiatives that increase the number and diversity of citizens who support and carry out the conservation and restoration activities necessary to achieve the goals and commitments of the agreement."

Additionally, the Management Strategy Elements section of the New Agreement should include language stating that:

"All Management Strategies will incorporate approaches for engaging citizens in efforts to increase conservation and restoration actions, as appropriate, in the development and implementation of Management Strategies under this agreement."

LOCAL LEADERSHIP GOAL AND OUTCOMES

LOCAL LEADERSHIP GOAL AND OUTCOMES - CHANGED

Goal and Outcomes as of 6-27-13

Local Leadership Goal: Engage, empower, and facilitate leadership by local governments and other stakeholders.

Local Leadership Outcomes:

1. Build capacity of local governments by supporting annual leadership training for local elected officials and senior staff.
2. Increase communication between state and local governments to ensure that local governments understand the role they can play in achieving the goals outlined in the Agreement.

Comment Summary

Several local leaders felt the goal and outcomes should be included to engage, empower, and facilitate local leadership, and that such a goal and outcomes would help achieve most other goals and outcomes in the agreement.

Some felt that an outcome to create a Finance Advisory Committee for local governments would have the most benefit.

Team Resolution

LGAC recommends that a next generation Bay Agreement acknowledge the vital role of local governments in accomplishing the goals outlined therein and suggests that the Bay Agreement clearly address the need to engage, empower and facilitate local implementation. Building the capacity of local governments to take action is vital to the Bay restoration effort and should be clearly reflected in the new agreement.

Updated Goal and Outcomes 8-16-13

Local Government Leadership Goal: Engage, empower and facilitate local governments as partners in the protection and restoration of the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

Local Government Leadership Outcomes:

1. Build **leadership** capacity of local governments ~~by supporting annual leadership training for local elected officials and senior staff~~ to implement local actions by increasing local government officials' knowledge of local water resources issues and the economic, cultural and policy incentives available to support implementation of actions that help achieve the goals of the Bay Agreement.
2. Increase ~~communication~~ **delivery of tools and resources**, such as GIS based analytical tools, water quality monitoring data, an environmental finance clearing house, technical assistance, and funding to ~~ensure that local governments understand the role they can play in achieving the goals outlined in the Agreement~~ empower local governments to develop and implement locally based approaches to water resource protection and restoration.
3. **Provide economic incentives to local governments who participate in the implementation of actions that help achieve the Goals outlined in the Bay Agreement.**
4. **Increase the number of communities utilizing creative financing strategies to implement local actions that help achieve the goals of the Bay Agreement.**

Editorial Board "public friendly" Agreement Version

Local Government Leadership Goal: No change.

- No change.
- Increase delivery of tools and resources: such as GIS-based analytical tools; water quality monitoring data; an environmental finance clearing house; technical assistance; and funding to empower local governments to develop and implement locally based approaches to water resource protection and restoration.
- No change.
- No change.

ISSUES RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE RESOLUTIONS

CLIMATE CHANGE - CHANGED

Comment Summary

A goal should be explicitly included for adaptation to and management of climate change, especially regarding sea level rise, warming effects on spawning and Bay grasses, and increasing storm intensity, which will contribute to storm water runoff and erosion.

Team Resolution

The Issues Resolution Committee reaffirmed the Management Board's decision that climate change should not be included as a goal, but adapting to "changing environmental conditions" should be included as a cross-cutting issue to be addressed in the Management Strategies for outcomes because it is a factor influencing the Partnership's ability to meet goals and outcomes.

DATA MANAGEMENT - CHANGED

Comment Summary

The Management Board directed the Issues Resolution Committee to determine if and how to include data management in the agreement. It was suggested as an outcome under the 2017 Water Quality Outcome, or within the Operational Commitments.

Team Resolution

The Issues Resolution Committee determined that introductory Water Quality Goal language, aligned with language already approved by the PRINCIPALS' STAFF COMMITTEE for BMP Verification, will be included in the Preamble. The Editorial Board will develop introductory language for the Water Quality section, which the Issues Resolution Committee will review. A broad statement regarding transparency across the entire program is also recommended to be included in the Principles.

TOXIC CONTAMINANT OUTCOMES - CHANGED

Outcome as of 7-11-13 (the draft language was included in Appendix A of the draft agreement.)

Toxic Contaminants Outcome: Improve knowledge of the effects of contaminants of emerging concern on the health of fish and wildlife so future strategies can be considered.

Comment Summary

The Management Board agreed to include the research-oriented outcome for toxic contaminants, and directed the Issues Resolution Committee to determine

Toxics should be separate from other goals to help jurisdictions choose commitments.

Many stakeholders felt that a goal on toxic contaminants and endocrine disruptors should be included in the agreement, especially as they relate to human health. It was also suggested that the toxics language be expanded to include bio-accumulative chemicals and carcinogens.

Team Resolution

The Toxics Ad Hoc Workgroup developed several options to include a second Outcome on toxic contaminants reductions. The majority of the Issues Resolutions Committee agreed that an option that targets certain contaminants for reduction should be included. Among three reduction Outcome options, two gained significant support:

- *“Option 2”: Identify and implement practices to reduce loadings of persistent bio-accumulative and toxic (PBT) contaminants and non-(PBT) contaminants that have an effect on ecosystem resources and human health.*
- *“Option 3”: A contaminant reductions outcome that targets a limited number of priority contaminants for which reductions are known to be needed: Identify and implement practices to reduce loadings of PCBs and mercury to the Bay and watershed.*

NY and PA indicated they could accept option 2 or 3. MD and CBC prefer option 2, and the other IRC members, except VA, prefer option 3. Therefore, option 3, which had the broadest support, is recommended to the Principals' Staff Committee for a decision, with the note that Virginia did not agree to include any additional options, even if they could choose to not sign on to the Management Strategy for the outcome.

Updated Outcomes 9-4-13

Toxic Contaminants Outcome: Improve knowledge of the effects of contaminants of emerging concern on the health of fish and wildlife so future strategies can be considered.

Toxic Contaminants Reduction Outcome: Identify and implement practices to reduce loadings of PCBs and mercury to the Bay and watershed.

Editorial Board “public friendly” Agreement Version

No change.

CONOWINGO DAM – NO CHANGE

Comment Summary

The Management Board determined an outcome for the Conowingo Dam was not suitable for the agreement, but directed the Issues Resolution Committee to consider stakeholder comments. Stakeholders were concerned about the public perception of not including the Conowingo in the agreement, and were concerned about the implications on the dam's downstream waters.

Team Resolution

The Issues Resolution Committee recommended that all language referring to the Conowingo Dam be removed from the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement as the scale and level of detail was not appropriate for the agreement document.

FRACKING – NO CHANGE

Comment Summary

Stakeholders were concerned about the typically water-intensive process of fracking, as well as the increased erosion and storm water runoff resulting from land clearing, grading, and well site and infrastructure development.

Team Resolution

The Issues Resolution Committee determined that specifics on fracking are not appropriate in this agreement. The issue is not at the scale or level of detail appropriate for this Agreement.

The issue of fracking is being addressed by the Phase II WIP.

LAND USE – NEW

Comment Summary

Maryland strongly supported the inclusion of land use planning outcomes under various goals, and was concerned that the lack of land use in the agreement would be perceived as backing away from commitments made in previous agreements.

Several stakeholders suggested that a sound land use goal be included in the agreement, or recommended that outcomes be included under several goal areas. Some suggested that a geographic approach be taken to limit impervious surface development around sub-watersheds that are still considered healthy or around those that are more highly affected by development.

Team Resolution

Several jurisdictions could not agree to include land use in the agreement as a set of outcomes as recommended by Maryland because it is seen as a local issue that is outside the authority of state governments. The Chesapeake Bay Commission worked with Maryland to craft alternative land use language for consideration by the Issues Resolution Committee. All but 1 jurisdiction of the IRC agreed to include the new set of outcomes under the Land Conservation Goal.

Updated Outcomes 9-4-13

2015 Land Use Outcome: By 2015, develop a Chesapeake Bay watershed-wide methodology and metrics for measuring the rate of land conversions of agricultural and forest lands, and for measuring the extent and rate of change in impervious surface coverage.

2017 Land Use Outcome: By 2017, evaluate policy options and identify potential incentives, resources and other tools that could assist local governments in their efforts to better manage and, when possible, reduce the rate of consumption of agricultural and forest lands, and conversion of porous landscape to impervious surface.

Editorial Board “public friendly” Agreement Version

No change.

SOCIAL SCIENCE ACTION TEAM

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC INDICATORS

Comment Summary

The goals and outcomes of this agreement will require a committed effort to understand the motivations and decision-making processes of citizens in the watershed, and a willingness to implement programs that can change behaviors.

Team Resolution

The following language will be included in the Operational Commitments:

Given the rich ecological, economic, and socio-cultural diversity of the Chesapeake Bay watershed, the partnership is well positioned to explore the development of specific social and economic indicators to better understand and measure how human behavior and other social science considerations can drive natural resource management, decision-making, and use. The ability to measure key social and economic dynamics associated with Chesapeake Bay restoration can play an integral role in achieving the goals, outcomes, and management strategies articulated in the Bay Agreement. The development of these indicators will continue to be explored by the partnership as the Bay Agreement evolves over time.

Editorial Board “public friendly” Agreement Version

Given the rich ecological, economic, and socio-cultural diversity of the Chesapeake Bay watershed, the **Chesapeake Bay Program** Partnership is well positioned to explore the development of specific social and economic indicators to better understand and measure how human behavior and other social science considerations can drive natural resource management, decision-making, and use. The ability to measure key social and economic dynamics associated with Chesapeake Bay restoration can play an integral role in achieving the goals, outcomes, and management strategies articulated in the **Bay** Agreement. The development of these indicators will continue to be explored by the partnership as the Bay Agreement evolves over time.