

# Principals' Staff Committee Meeting

## Management Board Outcome Based Decision Summary

Lee McDonnell  
Acting Director, EPA Chesapeake Bay Program Office

March 28, 2025



# MB Consensus Achieved – No Follow Up Needed

1. Sustainable Schools – **Reclassify (to Environmental Literacy Planning)**
2. Environmental Literacy Planning - **Update**
3. Student - **Update**
4. Stewardship - **Update**
5. Diversity - **Replace**
6. Public Access – **Update**
7. Protected Lands – **Update**
8. Submerged Aquatic Vegetation – **Update**
9. Oysters – **Update**
10. Blue Crab Abundance – **Update**
11. Blue Crab Management – **Remove**
12. Toxic Contaminants Research– **Consolidate**
13. Toxics Policy and Prevention – **Consolidate**
14. Water Quality Standards Attainment and Monitoring – **Update**
15. 2017 Watershed Implementation Plan – **Remove**
16. 2025 Watershed Implementation Plan – **Update**
17. Black Duck – **Reclassify (to Wetlands)**
18. Wetlands – **Update**
19. Local Leadership – **Update**
20. Adaptation – **Update**
21. Land Use Methods and Metrics Development – **Reclassify (to Land Use Decision Support)**

**Update - 13**  
**Reclassify - 3**  
**Remove – 2**  
**Consolidate – 2**  
**Replace - 1**

# MB Consensus Achieved – Follow Up Needed

1. Tree Canopy – **Update**
2. Forest Buffers – **Update**
3. Monitoring and Assessment – **Replace**
4. Land Use Options Eval - **Replace**
5. Healthy Watersheds – **Reclassify**
6. Fish Habitat - **Update**
7. Forage Fish – **Reclassify**
8. Brook Trout - **Update**
9. Stream Health- **Update**
10. Fish Passage - **Update**

**Update - 6**  
**Reclassify - 2**  
**Remove – 0**  
**Consolidate – 0**  
**Replace - 2**

# Tree Canopy: Update (no stop or holds)

## Forest Buffers: Update (no stop or holds)

### MB Discussion Summary:

- The MB recognizes the importance of and supports maintaining an emphasis on Tree Canopy and Forest Buffers.
- The MB directs the Forestry Workgroup to consider how we can broaden and better highlight opportunities for forest conservation and restoration.
- The Forestry Workgroup will consider if consolidation or reclassification under a single outcome makes sense, with the inclusion of distinct Tree Canopy and Forest Buffer targets.
- This discussion will be revisited on April 10, 2025.

### Question for PSC Consideration and Discussion:

- What are benefits of remaining an outcome versus risks of becoming an output or another structure (indicator/activity) within the Agreement?

# Monitoring and Assessment: Replace (no stop or holds)

## MB Discussion Summary:

- The MB recognizes that a framework for changing environmental conditions is an important aspect of managing our outcomes; this should be reflected in our work.
- A framework for changing environmental conditions should be developed and implemented across the partnership but may not be an outcome.
- The MB will discuss how this framework can be lifted up into practice across the partnership.

## Question for PSC Consideration and Discussion:

- How are cross cutting themes incorporated within the Agreement structure (changing environmental conditions, and other cross cutting outcomes, etc.)?

# Land Use Options and Eval: Replace (no stop or holds) Healthy Watersheds: Reclassify (no stop or holds)

## MB Discussion Summary:

- The MB appreciates the work that the GIT has put into redeveloping its recommendations and supports the outcome dispositions proposed by the GIT.
- The MB reserves the prerogative to pursue structure conversations and decisions outside of the GIT's recommendations to ensure that watershed health maintains the appropriate focus within the partnership.
- The MB may make recommendations related to changing the Goals.

## Question for PSC Consideration and Discussion:

- How does a changing goal framework impact reclassification of outcomes?

Fish Habitat: Update (no stops or holds)

Forage Fish: Reclassify under Fish Habitat (no stops or holds)

PSC Note:

We worked through fish habitat and forage fish, but discussions remain on whether to have a broader fish habitat outcome or separate tidal and nontidal fish habitat outcomes.

# Brook Trout, Stream Health, Fish Passage (and Proposed Nontidal Fish Habitat)

- **MB members have reached consensus with the following considerations, but have different opinions on the merits of combining, reclassifying, and/or updating Brook Trout, Stream Health, Fish Passage, and the proposed Nontidal Fish Habitat as unique outcomes.**
- Among a variety of points discussed, members noted that combining outcomes creates risks related to public perception and the alienation of partners.
- Other members noted that not combining outcomes has risks associated with partner capacity to support work towards accomplishing the outcomes, the effective allocation of resources, and the opportunity to work more strategically.
- GIT leadership and signatory MB members who have participating members in these outcomes, along with their practitioners, **will convene with as many attendees as is feasible to discuss synergies and alignments between the Brook Trout, Stream Health, Fish Passage, and the proposed Nontidal Fish Habitat Outcomes before the April 10, 2025 MB meeting.**
- The Habitat GIT will convene this conversation with support from the Chesapeake Bay Commission and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, including utilizing a Pennsylvania facilitator.
- The MB also seeks PSC feedback related to the disposition of these outcomes.



# Brook Trout, Stream Health, Fish Passage (and Proposed Nontidal Fish Habitat)

- Brook Trout: Update (1 Initial Hold, No stops or holds)
- Stream Health: Update (1 Initial Hold, No stops or holds)
- Fish Passage: Update (1 Initial Hold, No stops or holds)

## **Question for PSC Consideration and Discussion:**

- What are the pros and cons for consolidating to increase strategic coordination versus keeping existing structure?

# Key Overarching Question

## **Chesapeake Executive Council Charge to the Principals' Staff Committee: Charting a Course Beyond 2025**

“A simplified and streamlined structure and process for the partnership that supports all partners as they work toward achieving their commitments in an effective, efficient, and inclusive manner.”

### **Question for PSC Consideration and Discussion:**

What are the PSC's expectations and intention for simplifying and streamlining?