

## Recommended Adaptations and Actions from the May 11 Management Board Meeting: Science and Monitoring items

### Healthy Watersheds Outcome

Monitoring and assessment of healthy watersheds (Evaluate how existing monitoring efforts (within the Bay Program partnerships, cross-GIT, etc.) can be leveraged by the GIT to assess healthy watershed status. Use the evaluation results to help jurisdictions better prioritize healthy watersheds when allocating limited resources for monitoring. ☐

### Protected Lands Outcome

Support and effectively credit land conservation in the updates to the Bay models and Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) by creating strong incentives going forward for: (1) The placement of science appropriate BMPs on permanently protected lands, and (2) The permanent protection of large landscapes of resource lands from conversion in combination with other possible measures.

### Stream Health Outcome

Funding to establish the 2008 baseline and document progress towards Outcome. The Stream Health Workgroup asks that the Management Board assist in helping to secure \$18,000 in funding to establish the 2008 baseline and document progress towards our Outcome. The baseline data has already been collected, the funding would cover the costs of analyzing the data. Without a baseline, it is difficult to measure outcome progress.

### Brook Trout Outcome

Support for cross-GIT collaboration, monitoring programs.

We ask that the Management Board designate CBP staff support to help develop a plan to increase communication/outreach of brook trout conservation opportunities with key decision-makers and to coordinate cross-GIT collaboration. Designating staff to concentrate on these efforts will allow for Brook Trout Action Team Members to focus on workplan key actions, resulting in better progress toward the Outcome.

### Fish Habitat Outcome

Why are we requesting the management board to “Incorporate fish habitat into the Phase III Watershed Implementation Plans?”

The Fish Habitat Outcome aims to inform fish habitat conservation and restoration efforts. However, there is currently no method to educate and inform fish habitat to partners and stakeholders. WIPs on the other hand, have established an effective and efficient means of reaching counties and localities in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed. While there are other methods to reach localities and counties outside of the WIP, it would not prove to be as efficient and broad.

What kind of information are we suggesting is provided through the Phase III Watershed Implementation Plans?

Communication Materials.

a) Estimation of BMP Impact on Chesapeake Bay Program Management Strategies Matrix- This matrix can be used by local government to assess the impact BMPs will have on CBP's management strategies, including fish habitat. This matrix is intended to show the co-benefits and relative impact on additional goals that are important to the locality from nutrient and sediment load reduction BMPs.

b) BMP Impact List Best Suited for Specific Habitat Conditions- Fish habitat considerations vary geographically across the Bay Watershed and for each of our partner jurisdictions. In order to refine the suite of BMPs that benefit fish habitat, the Fish Habitat Action Team will develop a list of Best Management Practices (BMPs) best suited for four habitat conditions identified in the Fish Habitat Management Strategy:

- Tidal Saltwater nearshore
- Tidal Saltwater subtidal
- Non-tidal cold upstream waters
- Non-tidal warm water

These lists would be provided to localities/counties to guide their BMP selection process in a manner that incorporates corollary fish habitat benefits into local site-specific restoration and conservation projects. Individual jurisdictions could select fish habitat BMPs from the document list that best represents habitat conditions in their locality/county.

c) Impervious Surface and Hardened Shoreline Stressors- To guide our progress moving forward, the Fish Habitat Action Team has identified two priority stressors to fish habitat: 1) percent impervious surface in a watershed, and 2) percent hardened shoreline. Both stressors have resulted in negative impacts on fish habitat, fish abundance and biodiversity. The Fish Habitat team will develop documents that educate and encourage action in counties and localities related to the impacts of these stressors. In addition to providing increased fish habitat value, impervious surface and hardened shoreline improvements can offer numerous co-benefits to other outcomes under the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement such as blue crab, oyster, forage, wetlands, water quality, citizen stewardship, protected lands, climate, healthy watersheds, and SAV.

#### [Fish Passage Outcome](#)

The Fish Passage Workgroup asks that the Management Board recommend that state dam safety offices consider ecological harm/impacts due to dam failure in addition to public safety concerns. The encouragement of dam removals could be made easier through state agency coordination (e.g. State Highway Administration, Department of Environment and Dam Safety).