



Healthy Landscapes Goal Team Meeting

September 30, 2026

10:00AM - 1:00PM

[Visit the meeting webpage for meeting materials and additional information.](#)

Action items:

- Workgroup members: Do not edit lists of signatory programs and authorities - work with your Goal Team reps to work it out. This should be a snapshot of programs, not an exhaustive list
- Healthy Landscapes Goal Team members need to sign off on the Healthy Landscapes Management Strategy by October 16th. A final version will be sent on October 9th. Send emails indicating consent or dissent to Peter Claggett, pclaggett@usgs.gov

Timeline and Due Dates:

- October 9th: All draft workgroup Management Strategies are due to the Goal Team
- October 16th: Goal Team Voting Members due date to sign off on the full Healthy Landscapes Management Strategy via an email vote.
- October 19th: Goal Team Leadership due date to send approved Management Strategy to EPA CBPO
- October 22nd: EPA's due date to send the entire Strategic Plan to the PSC
- November 5th: PSC meeting to discuss and approve the Strategic Plan before Public Feedback
- November 20th: Goal Team due date to revise Management Strategies based on requested PSC revisions

HLGT Leadership Action Items:

- Edit challenges and management approaches for Goal Team level
- Send full Goal Team management strategies to workgroup coordinators and chairs.
- Email all deadlines to the workgroup coordinators
- Elevate to the PSC:
 - Work out framing the ICC removal from bay program engagement re: PLWG Tribal Homelands Target
 - Navigating funding, prioritization, and science support for workgroups and Goal Teams
- Organize a SET meeting to figure out how tracking outreach and engagement could work

Decision Results: (See each agenda item for more details)

- The July HLGT meeting minutes were approved.

- **All nominees for At-Large Voting Member, Non-Voting Member, and Advisory Committee Representative for the Healthy Landscapes Goal Team were approved for their respective membership status.**

Meeting Minutes

Purpose: 1) Review the proposed management approaches within the draft management strategies for the four outcomes under the Healthy Landscapes Goal; and 2) use that information to refine the Goal Team level management strategy.

I. Introductions (10:00 – 10:15)

Ken and Claire welcomed the Goal Team signatory members and meeting participants. All signatory members and At-Large nominees introduced themselves. A decision on approval of the meeting minutes from the July HLGTT meeting occurred among the signatory voting members of the Healthy Landscapes Goal Team. The decision to approve the minutes passed with unanimous consent.

Decision Results:

- 1. The July HLGTT meeting minutes were approved.**

Lead: Ken Hyer, USGS, Claire Jantz, PA DCNR.

Materials: [July Meeting Minutes](#).

Workgroup Updates:

Jackie Pickford: The Land Use Workgroup has been working on the land use forecasts for the business as usual (BAU) scenario for Phase 7 CAST. Over the next few weeks, the LUWG, along with the Urban Stormwater Workgroup, will be approving the final urban and solar forecasts for use in Phase 7 CAST.

Ken Hyer: We will continue to have a few minutes at every PSC meeting for Claire and I to highlight anything we want to bring forward. The next meeting is Nov 5th; I propose getting into a rhythm to put out a call for things to be brought forward to the PSC 3 weeks in advance of their meetings.

II. Membership Status (10:15 – 10:45)

Peter reviewed the membership status of the Goal Team and Workgroups and identified any gaps in signatory representation and at-large membership across the workgroups.

Decision Results:

1. A decision to approve the nominees for At-Large Voting Members, Non-Voting Members, and Advisory Committee Representatives occurred at the Goal Team level.
All nominees were approved for their respective membership status.

Requested Action: Decisional.

Lead: Peter Claggett, USGS

Materials: [Membership Presentation Slides](#)

Healthy Landscapes Goal Team:

- Vacancies:

- Staffer position. The [Job Announcement](#) has been posted, and applications are due on October 15th.
- Some Signatory Alternate positions
- All Voting Members for Signatories, and At-Large Members have been filled or nominated.

Forestry Workgroup:

- Vacancies:
 - Staffer position. The [Job Announcement](#) has been posted, and applications are due on October 15th.
 - Two At-Large positions
- All signatory voting members and alternates are filled.

Adaptation Workgroup:

- Vacancies;
 - Staffer
 - West Virginia Signatory position. Awaiting to hear from WV
 - Several Alternate Signatory positions
 - Three At-Large positions, with preference towards academic/nonprofit representation

Land Use Workgroup:

- Vacancies:
 - Staffer position: The [Job Announcement](#) has been posted, and applications are due on October 15th.
 - West Virginia Signatory position
 - Two At-Large positions

Protected Lands Workgroup:

- Vacancies:
 - Three At-Large positions
- Awaiting to hear from MD and VA reps to figure out who will be the voting member, alternate, or non-voting member.

Discussion:

Chris Guy: To note, if a signatory chooses to not place someone in a Signatory Voting spot on a workgroup, that spot can fall towards another At-Large member. Secondly, the GMF calls that to get to consensus, a quorum of voting members must be present. It is required for the Goal Team to approve the workgroup membership as well.

Laura Cattell Noll: A quick clarification: Richard Baugh from LGAC is an advisory committee representative.

Amanda Cather: And from AAC, Amanda Cather should be on the list as well

Jess Blackburn: The Stakeholders' Committee rep's name is spelled incorrectly- Patrick McDonnell.

- Hot off the press: STAC member will be Scott Knoche

Ken Hyer: Membership as of today is set, and we will revisit as needed to update that.

III. Current Outcome Management Strategies 10-15min each (10:45 – 11:50)

Each workgroup lead reviewed their near-final Management Strategies with emphasis on:

- Management approaches

- Jurisdictional programs and authorization status
- Approval process

Requested Action: Non-decisional (i.e., discussion and presentation only).

Lead: Julie Reichert-Nguyen, NOAA; Katie Brownson, USFS; Jackie Pickford, USGS; Sophie Waterman, USGS.

Presentation Slides:

- [Healthy Forests and Trees Presentation Slides Management Strategy](#)
- [Adaptation MS Presentation 09 30 26](#)
- [HLGT Land Use Management Strategy Update Sept2026 Pickford](#)
- [Protected Lands Management Strategy Update 1](#)

Materials:

- [Healthy Forests and Trees Draft Management Strategy](#)
- [Land Use Decision Support Near Final Management Strategy](#)
- [Protected Lands Draft Management Strategy V3](#)

Discussion:

Ken Hyer: Updates from Goal Team Chairs calls:

- The list of jurisdiction authorities and signatory programs will be moved to an appendix.
- Members are not to edit the signatory programs and authorities. Work with your Goal Team reps and the PSC rep to add programs you think should be included.
- The workgroup and Goal Team will be approving the releases of the subchapters and chapters for PSC review in November
- The audience of these subchapters is still the Workgroup and Goal Team. A separate product will be made for a more public-friendly version.
- The Healthy Landscapes Goal Team will need to have a review complete by October 16th. The finished product is due on October 19th, so that the EPA can be ready to send all Goal Team Management Strategies to the PSC on October 22nd.
- All signatory programs are considered draft until reviewed and approved by the PSC. Please work with Sarah Brzezinski when requesting edits to the signatory programs.

Adaptation Outcome:

- **Rob Schnabel:** I want to emphasize really cross-pollinating with the current workgroups
 - It would be good to see which certain practices are overemphasized, just looking at nutrients, which is impacting resilience when looking at heat waves and loss of trees for stream construction. Even just maintaining watershed function and maintaining base flow in streams and recharging aquifers. Just want to make sure that discussion happens as we're overemphasizing practices that are hurting potential adaptation.
 - **Ben McFarlane:** Lots of focus has been on coastal areas, but are emphasizing the importance of working with upland communities and those areas around the water. That's a key gap we have on the workgroup with membership, and lots of work has been done for including tidally influenced environments and perspectives.
 - **Rob Schnabel:** Thank you Ben! MS4 can be a tool to focus more on Ecosystem benefit practices which would help with Adaptation (not just sediment/nutrients). The STAC determined credits for stream construction has had the unintended impact of significant forest loss in urban areas and not addressing the upland areas for watershed function and long term success. For Maryland, perhaps one of the 5 watersheds that are part of MD's Whole Watershed Act program.

- **Katie Brownson, from chat:** Could be a good opportunity to collaborate with the stream health workgroup
- **Jeff Lerner, from chat:** PLWG has a nexus with adaptation. Protection of land as a strategy that can help maintain or build resilience in a watershed, including drinking water supply.
- **Kevin Du Bois:** As the workgroup develops case studies and lessons learned, is there any value in trying to put some emphasis on different suites of partners in the process? Not always state and federal or NGO, but having a diversity of suites of partners that work on adaptation projects. Coming from DoW, and REPI projects, we look at nature-based approaches and a variety of partners.
 - **Ben McFarlane:** We are going to be working in different types of communities for selecting sub-watershed priorities and working with different types of partners. Our goal is 7, but my goal is that this work can inform a lot of the work going on in other communities.
- **Steve Saari:** I heard recently from CBP leadership that there would not be additional funding coming from CBP for Goal Team implementation work. Will that modify anything you are looking at for selection strategy, how people might need to bring their own money to the project.
 - **Ben McFarlane:** I had not heard that yet, but available capacity on the ground is something to look at, and existing jurisdictional funding programs established that could help support this work. The work needs to be done, funding is part of the challenge, but we can look at in-kind resources and small improvements as well when needed.

Healthy Forests and Trees:

- **Ken Hyer:** We should get Katie feedback based on how to incorporate SET feedback. How long would you need to update that text?
 - **Katie Brownson:** It would be quick
 - **Ken Hyer:** Do folks think we can make forestry make those edits, and still have time for providing comments by October 9th?
- **Peter Claggett:** Related question about SET, comment about measuring effectiveness of outreach and engagement. That is something shared across outcomes; lots of stuff we do is support. How do you measure that? Since it's shared, maybe the Goal Team could engage in addressing that issue.
 - Action item: make a SET meeting and talk about how that could work.

Land Use Decision Support:

- **Cassie Davis, in chat:** I'm a huge fan of the tree canopy factsheet as an example product. The fact that a municipality can click on a map to get a unique factsheet for their community is wonderful!
- **Rob Schnabel, in chat:** The Counties Tree canopy fact sheet is great and would be helpful to include % riparian forest buffers on those sheets too. Counties may set new goals and this would help them figure out a baseline.
 - **Peter Claggett:** That's a great idea. We've also been discussing the creation of impervious cover and/or development fact sheets- with details on what types of development are occurring and what's being impacted- forests vs farmland.

Protected Lands:

- Re: duplication of Signatory Programs:
 - **Holly Walker:** DE didn't replicate programs against different targets and outcomes because we were also being required to estimate the amount of funding in that particular program. It can be difficult to estimate the funding and then try to break it out further, what specifically is going to just this target or this outcome. So it was kind of directed not to replicate in certain situations.

- **Claire Jantz:** All signatory programs will be in an Appendix at the end of the full Strategic Plan, to be separated by outcome.
- **Claire Jantz:** Since this is the first call out for a PSC request coming up from a workgroup about the tribal homes target, we need to flag that for the next PSC meeting.
 - **Sophie Waterman:** ICC [Public Statement from Our Board of Directors](#)
 - **Ken Hyer:** And I don't know if we can do this without the engagement with the Tribes and ICC. Are there multiple options beyond pausing development on this target until further notice?
 - **Sophie Waterman:** In my perspective, I don't feel super comfortable moving forward since ICC was the one who brought this target forward, and we were in a supporting role to help them with the process for the target development

IV. **Goal Team Level Management Strategy** (11:50 – 12:50)

Ken and Claire will review the Goal Team Management Strategy, consolidating themes from each of the outcomes' Strategies, and ask for feedback from the HLGT to prepare the document for PSC review.

Note: HLGT members are asked to review and comment on the combined HLGT Management Strategy via email by October 9th. Send emails to Peter Claggett (pclaggett@usgs.gov).

Decision: HLGT members are asked to vote to approve the combined HLGT Management Strategy via email by October 16th. Send emails to Peter Claggett (pclaggett@usgs.gov).

Lead: Ken Hyer, USGS, Claire Jantz, PA DCNR

Materials:

- [Healthy Landscapes Goal Team Draft Management Strategy](#)

Discussion:

Peter Claggett: We need to add a statement as to how each Goal Team Management Approach is related to an Outcome within that Goal.

- **Katie Brownson:** These might be too general, and we could add more meat on the bones to make them less of themes and more of actionable approaches.
 - I found this tidbit from the template to be helpful: Management Approaches should be specific enough to guide partnership efforts over the coming six years and to enable the partnership to determine if work related to the Management Approach has progressed at an appropriate pace. Example: a Management Approach would not be “communications and outreach,” but rather “Assess Blue Crab Stock Status and Communicate the Results to Managers and the Public.” Management Approaches should be specific enough to be meaningful and provide transparency about the work that partners will collaboratively undertake
- **Anne Hairston-Strang:** It covers lots of ground, but like Katie was inferring, is there another level of planning for looking at annual goals for what workgroups need to do.
 - **Ken Hyer:** I think we can add more meat on the bone to be more specific. In these approaches, we are trying to identify common challenges and then reflect how the Goal Team can make progress.
- **Julie Reichert-Nguyen:** Looking at the funding one, this should apply to all outcomes in HL, but a gap is research dollars we had in the past to help develop indicators. Now without STAR, I'm not sure what is replacing that science report in the bay program, but lots of our groups need that set-aside funding for science research and monitoring. Right now I don't think I'm seeing support from the bay program for that. Maybe we work with NFWF or another team.

- **Peter Claggett:** At the Goal Team Chairs meeting, a discussion topic was that we don't have resources to meet the outcomes at times. We can raise this to the PSC's attention.
- **Chris Guy:** I think being too specific could be a bad thing, and like keeping it general. The funding moving forward won't be discretionary GIT funding, but it may be more state directed funds. Dan said he wants the PSC to recognize priorities on funding, and with everything being a priority it may be difficult to get that funding. I think there is a worthwhile discussion to have with NFWF for Chesapeake WILD for how we incorporate priorities of the bay program into their funding. But for Chesapeake WILD, we don't want the bay program to direct that funding.
- **Katie Brownson:** The Goal Team needs to address challenges that are priorities in bold as well.
- **Ken Hyer:** Where I think the Goal Team can make a huge impact is coordination and local engagement, especially with land use change models and engaging with trusted community groups. My concern on the funding and policy is that so much of it occurs above us, so can we as a Goal Team drive that? We can raise awareness at least.
 - **Katie Brownson, in chat:** If we are bolding challenges, I liked Ken's take on highlighting 1,3, and 5 as challenges that we are best able to address
 - **Anne Hairston-Strang, in chat:** I see coordination as an underlying priority that CBP is well-positioned to do and could help inform the other challenges.
- **Steve Saari:** WE could highlight the X's as well for specific outcomes, if they are priorities for different outcomes.
 - Julie Reichert-Nguyen, in chat: I would add an x for Adaptation for funding
- **Cassie Davis:** We could also denote CEC associated challenges. Specifically land use change, policy, and local engagement.
- **Peter Claggett:** I think as a state federal partnership, we should do more of the policy coordination work
 - Steve Saari: Agreed that CBP doesn't do policy regulation, but they do provide examples of good local policy and regulation for others, and think that is an appropriate place for us to work.
- Chris Guy:** I suggest changing Management approach 3.0.4 "Policy" to "Scientific support for Policy"
 - We can make recommendations on how policy can be improved, and think people on our workgroups/Goal Teams can recommend someone look at policy but not be driving policy. The text should not imply that we are generating policy.
- **Jeff Lerner:** Not all policy is regulatory. For much of our work in protected lands (and other aspects of Healthy landscapes) we work with proactive voluntary conservation programs. Is that worth emphasizing?
- **Rob Schnabel:** Scientific support guiding land use as it relates to water infiltration and retention for watershed function. Support guiding science of importance of location in the landscape of where restoration / protection has the greatest impact. Importance of headwaters for Healthy Watersheds and overall Adaptation. I'm working on policy now where that would be extremely helpful
- **Katie Brownson:** The content of the management strategy will need to be reviewed by the Goal Team. The signatory programs and authorities would be in appendix anyway and we can let workgroups work with jurisdictional reps and Goal Team reps to finalize that list on their end. That can go into a final document, rather than needing the Goal Team to sign off on the appendix as a whole.
 - **Chris Guy:** My understanding is that if the PSC has thoughts, it will come back to us anyway, so this is not final
- **Julie Reichert-Nguyen, in chat:** I've yet to hear any details on the prioritization process, so I would benefit from seeing that presentation

- **Lucinda Power:**
<https://www.chesapeakebay.net/files/documents/Updates-on-the-PSF-for-the-PSC-Sept-2026.pdf>
 - The priority setting framework was discussed at the Sept 21 PSC meeting (link to presentation above) and the GO team will be seeking approval of the framework doc at the Nov 5 PSC meeting (if approved, it will go to the EC).
- **Claire Jantz:** And the current policy document is this:
[CBP-Priority-Setting-Framework 9-2-2026-CLEAN.pdf](#)

V. Wrap-Up **(12:50 – 1:00)**
 Lead: Ken Hyer, USGS, Claire Jantz, PA DCNR

VI. Adjourn **(1:00)**
Next Meeting: December 8th or 10th, 2026. An invite will be sent shortly.

Attendance:

Daniel Koval, CRC
 Kenneth Hyer, USGS
 Sophie Waterman, USGS
 Peter Claggett, USGS
 Coral Howe, USGS
 Michelle Katoski, USGS
 Jackie Pickford, USGS
 John Wolf, USGS
 Aurelia Gracia, NPS
 Wendy O'Sullivan, NPS
 Chris Guy, USFWS
 Julie Reichert-Nguyen, NOAA
 Katie Brownson, USFS
 Christopher Hayes, FS, WV
 Maggie Woodward, CBC
 Marel King, CBC
 Anna Killius, CBC
 Megan Beaver, CBC
 Kevin Du Bois, DoW CBP
 Jeffery Lerner, EPA
 Lucinda Power, EPA
 Emily Heller, EPA
 Claire Jantz, PA DCNR
 Marty Qually, PA DCNR
 Christopher Peters, FPAC-NRCS, PA
 Deborah Herr Cornwell, MDP
 Alanna B Crowley, MD DNR
 Daniel Coy, MD DNR

Anne Hairston-Strang, MD DNR
 Nadya Chehab, MDA
 Holly Walker, DE DNREC
 Kerri Batrowny, DE DNREC
 Lori Brown, DE DNREC
 John Reynolds, DE DNREC
 Joseph Schell, DE DNREC
 Young Tsuei, DC DOEE
 Ariel Trahan, DC DOEE
 Steve Saari, DC DOEE
 Brendan Durkin, DC DOEE
 Robert Corletta, DC DDOT
 Danny Bennett, WV DNR
 Caitlin Verdu, VA GOV
 Elise Frazier, VA DEQ
 Kristy Woodall VA DEQ
 Arianna Johns, VA DEQ
 Suan Bulbulkaya, VA DCR
 Patricia Nylander, VA DOF
 Mary Bennett, VA DOF
 Molly Hassett, NY DEC
 Cassandra Davis, NY DEC
 Cass Klingaman, NY DEC
 Ben McFarlane, HRPDC
 Jessica Blackburn, Alliance
 Laura Cattell Noll, Alliance
 Amanda Cather, American Farmland
 Trust

Rosa Hance, CCWC
Lena Easton-Calabria, MARISA
Molly Mitchell
Krista Romita Grocholski
Justin Nowakowski
Michel Sheffer
Amy Freitag
Michael Maddox

Ashley Hullinger
Kelly Maloney
Rob Schnabel
Joel Cockerham
Emily Beach
Neil Kamal Ganju
Richard Baugh