



# PUBLIC FEEDBACK PROCESS AND INITIAL THEMES

Principals' Staff Committee Meeting  
August 20, 2025

# WHAT I'LL COVER TODAY...



Introducing the Review Team.



Current Process for Reviewing Public Feedback.



Proposed Timeline for Revisions.



Emerging High-Level Themes



Feedback for PSC Consideration



Questions

## REVIEW TEAM

Name	Organization
Jess Blackburn	Stakeholders' Advisory Committee
Meg Cole	Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee
Cassie Davis	New York Department of Environmental Conservation
Leila Duman	Maryland Department of Natural Resources
Amy Handen	Environmental Protection Agency
Ken Hyer	U.S. Geological Survey
Laura Cattell Noll	Local Government Advisory Committee
Lucinda Power	Environmental Protection Agency
Bailey Robertory	Maryland Department of Natural Resources
Grayson Shultz	Virginia Secretary of Natural and Historic Resources' Office
Scott Settle	West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection
Peter Tango	U.S. Geological Survey

# CURRENT PROCESS

Feedback arrives to [comments@chesapeakebay.net](mailto:comments@chesapeakebay.net).

## CBP Communications Office:

- Copies each email into a SharePoint folder for the Review Team to access if they need additional content.
- Removes identifiable information for individuals and posts feedback on “Planning for 2025 and Beyond” website.
- Extracts individual feedback into a spreadsheet and sorts it into one of 10 categories.

## Review Teams:

- Small Review Teams are meeting approximately every two weeks to talk through feedback.
- Larger Review Team has met once and will meet again after September 1 to work through any feedback that needs further discussion.

## Outcome leads have been sent first round of feedback and proposed actions;

- Will receive another on August 29 and a final batch the first week of September.
- They are encouraged to connect with Review Team members to discuss proposed revisions and offer insight.



# FEEDBACK CATEGORIZATION

Full Agreement

Thriving Habitats and  
Wildlife

Clean Water

Healthy Landscapes

Engaged Communities

Further Discussion

Structure/Governance

Editorial

No Response  
Required

Out of Scope

# PROPOSED TIMELINE

**2–8 Sep.**

Review Team members have cleared their schedules to work with feedback.

- During this time, will also connect with outcome leads on proposed revisions.

**23 Sep.**

Redlined version of the Watershed Agreement will be posted for the Management Board; every effort will be made to provide it earlier.

**1–9 Oct.**

Fatal flaw review by Management Board.

**28 Oct.**

PSC approval of revised Watershed Agreement.

Will present feedback to Management Board that requires their input; will make every effort to make this available at least 48 hours in advance.

**11 Sep.**

Management Board will review redlined version at retreat.

**29 Sep. – 1 Oct.**

Management Board approval of revised Watershed Agreement.

**9 Oct.**

Executive Council approval of revised Watershed Agreement.

**2 Dec.**



# FEEDBACK OVERVIEW

956 individual feedback emails to date.

898 of them came from Chesapeake Bay Foundation action alerts.

364 unique pieces of feedback.

Thriving Habitats and Wildlife Goal currently has received the most feedback, followed by Clean Water.



- The revised *Watershed Agreement* needs uniform, plain language outcomes and targets with consistent formats and deadlines.
- Concern that the revised *Watershed Agreement* weakens or omits legally binding agreements, such as the Bay TMDL and WIP commitments. It needs to include regular progress reporting, provide transparency and accountability, and include real consequences for missed targets.
- Criticism that some targets have been lowered from their 2014 *Watershed Agreement* goals. In particular, wetlands, SAV, forest buffers and tree canopy.
- Call to set enforceable limits for forage species—in particular, menhaden.
- Would like to see specific commitments to mitigate, monitor and reduce toxic contaminants in the revised Toxic Contaminants Outcome, not just knowledge sharing.
- Call for Healthy Landscapes Goal and related outcomes to incorporate assessment and mitigation measures when it comes to solar and industrial-scale development, such as warehouses and data centers. Fear that these land use changes are threatening forests, farms and water quality.



## EMERGING FEEDBACK THEMES



# QUESTIONS?

## Thank you!

Rachel Felver  
Chesapeake Bay Program  
Communications Director  
Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay  
[rfelver@chesapeakebay.net](mailto:rfelver@chesapeakebay.net)

