



Chesapeake Bay Program

Science. Restoration. Partnership.

SAV Workgroup Special Session: Outcome Assessment

Wednesday, January 15, 2025, 10:00-12:00 ET

[Link to the Meeting Materials](#)

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Presenter: Brooke Landry (MD DNR)

OVERVIEW OF OUTCOME ASSESSMENT TASK, BIG QUESTION, & OUTCOME VS. OUTPUT

Presenter: Bill Jenkins (EPA)

- SAV 2-pager due February 27th
- SAV 2-pager will be presented to the Management Board on March 13th
- Big Question: What advice do you have for the Management Board on how to consolidate, reduce, update, remove, replace or add new outcomes within your GIT?
- Logic Model: visual way to present your understanding of the relationships among the resources you have to operate your program, the activities you plan, and the changes or results you hope to achieve
 - Inputs: what is invested - the resources that go into a program
 - Outputs: what is done/produced/accomplished
 - Outcomes: the results – the effect of that output on the desired result
- Secret Sauce for a good outcome
 - Clear in its objective
 - Measurable
 - Has partner commitment
 - Has a monitoring program
 - Identified resources
 - Work is centered on benefits to people and living resources

SAV OUTCOME ASSESSMENT DISCUSSION

Presenter: Brooke Landry (MD DNR) & Becky Golden (NOAA)

- Don't need to include what the goal language at this point
- SAV Outcome Survey Results
 - 70% of respondents want to update the goal
 - 52% of respondents want to update the goal to 192,000 acres to match water quality standards
 - 100% of respondents comfortable with interim goals at 2030 and 2035
- Proposed Outcome Language



Chesapeake Bay Program

Science. Restoration. Partnership.

- “Sustain and increase the habitat benefits of SAV in the Chesapeake Bay. Achieve and sustain the ultimate outcome of **192,000 acres** of SAV Bay-wide necessary for a restored Bay. Progress toward this ultimate outcome will be measured against a target of **90,000 acres by 2030 and 130,000 acres by 2035** for the whole Bay. Progress will also be measured against the following targets for each salinity zone: Tidal Fresh: 21,320 acres, Oligohaline: 13,094 acres, Mesohaline: 122,021 acres, Polyhaline: 35,486 acres”
- Went through all the guidelines from the Big Question

Discussion:

- **Peter Tango:** Each outcome is supposed to include climate change considerations - 192K, 185K were built on baselines of long past conditions, is there consideration for climate adjusted goal targets?
 - **Brooke Landry:** Had the GIT funded project that looked at whether the current SAV goal would be feasible taking climate change into consideration and they found that it was not feasible based on climate change.
 - **Chris Patrick:** The model does not suggest that we will hit the 185,000 or 192,000 acres by 2060.
- **Chris Patrick:** Is it fair to change the goal because it's difficult to achieve? Feels like cheating to lower the bar.
 - **Brooke Landry:** The Bay Program wants the goals to be achievable, so we don't want pushback.
 - **Carl Friedrichs:** It doesn't make sense to have a goal that is scientifically unachievable, but we can go for the best result that's achievable according to the science.
 - **Mark Lewandowski:** I would think that it's fair to adjust the bar down given that current science and trends in water quality and effects of climate change have indicated the goal is unachievable.
 - **Peter Tango:** I liked CP's and BL's comments on achievability linked to certain expectations like going beyond TMDL targets given climate considerations - maybe that sort of statement of what is achievable under what conditions needs to be tied into the outcome update language, somehow capturing the assumptions succinctly coincident with the numeric target.
- **Joe Wood:** Virginia DEQ revised their WQS several years ago (to increase SAV standards by a couple thousand acres for a few segments in the James and Rap). It would not be a huge revision to the overall go, but will that be incorporated as a change to the magnitude?



Chesapeake Bay Program

Science. Restoration. Partnership.

- **Becky Golden:** Yes, if the new SAV outcome is based on the water clarity criteria acreage, we would want to make sure we are using the most up to date numbers.
- **Chris Guy:** Is there a potential range we could put in the outcome? Depending on climate change and adaptability of the Bay. You can still be achievable with an aspirational goal if we add the justifications/uncertainties in the Management Strategy.
- **Chris Patrick:** If we take a composite approach and take the best from each segment from the last 5 or 10 years you'll see a fairly linear path of increase.
 - **Carl Friedrich:** Like the idea of a rolling window. The variability is so high that it makes sense to not pool everything together all the time.
 - **Peter Tango:** Yes Chris! Match the outcome target to the derivation method would be a well justified science basis versus trying to match the present 3-year output to a period-based total baseline. Love that!
 - **Chris Guy:** I love that idea, and truly believe the Bay program goals are trend analysis not necessary a single number.
- **Peter Tango:** In 2014 it was an excellent representation of a SMART outcome. The structure is good, using the best science to update the outcome and keep it SMART beyond 2025 is the work after the 2-pager (not required in this first 2 pgr assignment).
- **Erin Shields:** I would argue direct restoration \$ is not well supported and would like to see that emphasized.
- **Chris Guy:** Do we have agreement that the current SAV Outcome as is SMART? Are people okay with the short term being achievable and the long term being aspirational?
- **Peter Tango:** Species invasions are an ongoing phenomenon across taxa at local to global scales; all our bay jurisdictions are experiencing new species introductions; SAV community composition is nonstationary. Long-term, something may change in biology of the system that either enhances or decreases capacity of the bay to harbor a set level of SAV. Maybe that is a fair justification for considering 5–10-year goals while caveating longer term targets pending relative stability of bay conditions.
- **Becky Swerida:** Resources needed not only for implementation but for restoration project specific monitoring.
- **Peter Tango:** SAV - has always seemed to be the quintessential indicator the public connects with on bay health.
- **Woody Francis:** I'm no expert on EJ-environmental justice, but that is a big item that may warrant a mention in some context possibly if relevant here.
- **Peter Tango:** Do you want to include climate resilience/carbon sequestration to capture climate change considerations?



Chesapeake Bay Program

Science. Restoration. Partnership.

ATTENDEES (31): Brooke Landry (MD DNR), Becky Golden (NOAA), Dede Lawal (CRC), Kayla Clauson (DNREC), Peter Tango (USGS), Richard Zimmerman (ODU), Kaitlin Scowen (MD DNR), Mike Johnson (MRC), Stephanie Hall (MD DNR), Victoria Hill (ODU), Amy O'Donnell (USFWS), Bill Jenkins (EPA), Mark Lewandowski (MD DNR), Nick Staten (CRC), Erin Shields (VIMS), Julie Luecke (CBF), Megan Fitzgerald (EPA), Carl Friedrichs (VIMS), Chris Guy (USFWS), Riley Kuhen (ARF), Bob Murphy (Tetra Tech), Joe Wood (CBF), Chris Patrick (VIMS), Woody Francis (USACE), Becky Swerida (MD DNR), Gabriel Duran (CRC), Bill Morgante (BPW), Anthony Timpano (VA DEQ), Patrick Boos (EPA), Dave Wilcox (VIMS), Tish Robertson (DEQ)