



Public Access Workgroup Meeting

August 18, 2026

2:00 - 4:00pm

Microsoft Teams [Need help?](#)

[Join the meeting now](#)

Meeting ID: 263 000 340 468 0

Passcode: WM9et3Wb

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

Purpose: This meeting covered important announcements on the management strategy drafting process and the 2025 data call, as well as continued discussions on how to define and track site upgrades/maintenance, ADA/ABA Accessibility, and greenspace access. Participants also heard from Chesapeake Region Accessible Boating (CRAB) about their work on increasing outdoor recreation opportunities for people with disabilities.

Decisional items that occurred in this meeting are marked with **red text**. Decisions include how to define and track site upgrades, how to track ADA/ABA Accessibility, and which tracking method(s) the Public Access Workgroup (PAWG) will pursue when tracking access to urban and community greenspace. More details can be found in each respective section below along with the result of each decisional item.

Summary of Decisions:

- **The upgrades proposal was approved:** The workgroup will create a qualitative list to define what upgrades will count towards the upgrades target. This will be a living document.
- **The ADA/ABA Accessibility tracking proposal was approved:** The workgroup will create a list of acceptable ADA/ABA improvements/amenities to use as a tracking guide for such projects.
- **The proposal for tracking access to greenspace was approved:** The workgroup will track acreage of greenspace, while working on better attributing public access data in the protected lands dataset to begin tracking access gaps through 10 Minute Walk Analyses.

Meeting Minutes

I. Welcome and Introductions

II. Announcements

The drafting team is finishing up with the draft public access sub-chapter, and workgroup members are asked to review and provide feedback by August 28th.

III. New Member Introductions (2:10 - 2:25pm)

The workgroup has new members from various jurisdictions and organizations. At Large membership includes representatives from the Trust for Public Land, the Chesapeake Bay National Estuarine Research Reserve - VA, Baltimore Greenspace, and Neighborspace of Baltimore County. Additional membership includes the jurisdictions of MD, VA, DE, PA, DC, and NY, along with NPS, USGS, and DoW.

IV. Overview of Chesapeake Bay Program / PAWG (2:25 - 2:40pm)

- Participants received an overview on the structure of the Bay Program and how it relates to the Public Access Workgroup and its membership, as well as the annual data call of public access sites and how the data is presented and shared online. See the presentation slides for visuals. Key points are summarized below.

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

Materials: Presentation Slides

Key Points:

- The Public Access Workgroup is one of 5 other workgroups underneath the Engaged Communities Goal Team. The Bay Program has four Goal Teams, each with a group of workgroups underneath.
- See page 19 of the [Watershed Agreement](#) for the new targets within the Public Access Outcome.
- The data collection happens at the beginning of each year, where jurisdictions will submit their updated list of sites from the previous calendar year. In the previous agreement, this only included new sites added each year. Moving forward, the data call will include aspects for the new targets (upgrades, maintenance, ADA/ABA Accessibility, and greenspace).
- Membership includes 1 or 2 Chairs, 15 Voting Members (9 are signatory appointees, 6 At-Large). All other members are Non-Voting members. All members are included when gathering consensus for a decision. If consensus cannot be made among all voting and non-voting members, only voting members vote.

V. Establishing Definitions for New Access Sites, Maintenance and Upgrades Guidelines (2:40 - 3:00pm)

- Lorenzo gave a summary of what is considered a “new site” from the [2013 Chesapeake](#)

[Bay Watershed Public Access Plan](#). A discussion followed on defining what is meant by upgrades to sites and maintenance to sites. The proposal to track upgrades included creating a qualitative list to define what upgrades will count towards the upgrades target. A decisional discussion for maintenance will be included in the next workgroup meeting.

Requested Action: Non-decisional Discussion and **Decisional Discussion**.

- **The upgrades proposal was approved:** The workgroup will create a qualitative list to define what upgrades will count towards the upgrades target. This will be a living document.

Key Points:

- Proposals for upgrades included developing a qualitative list of acceptable upgrades, and/or defining upgrades as investing X dollars into a site.

Discussion:

- Kristal McKelvey: I think dollars spent is a lot to ask and a lot to track. It could be reported, but I don't think that's how we should define it.
- Maggie Woodward: Second that. A blanket dollar amount is not going to be in proportion to the size of a given site. A qualitative list would be what we would prefer, as long as it is a living list that you could add to.
- Julia Wakeling: DC is of the same mind; dollars spent is an interesting metric and could be reported, but it does not portray the full picture of what is happening. For us, dollars spent includes lots of items, not just for one specific upgrade. Pulling that out might be difficult, especially for historical data. We are in favor of a qualitative list.
- Lorenzo Cinalli: Creating this qualitative list could be a workplan activity in the future, to be made by the entire workgroup.
- Lisa Wool: If you needed some type of statistic shown, there could be some value that is created based on acreage. So we know at minimum you are spending maintenance staff time for mowing/gas/ etc, that could be a dollar value attributed to the acreage of the areas that are being maintained by mowing. If you have X acres, you have X dollars in maintenance for mowing, for example.
 - Most of the big numbers that would be infrequent would be the upgrades. For general maintenance, we could talk to people maintaining parks and find some things that happen every year and find a dollar value per acre that we apply across the board.
- Phyllis Joris: That makes sense to me, as a small nonprofit we do a lot of staff and volunteer work to maintain sites. It would be difficult to parse out dollars per site or acre, but could do what was just said of here is the total hours and volunteer hours and divide that by the number of acres.
- Julia Wakeling: I think that would work for mowing specifically, but beyond an upgrade or maintenance that has an acreage qualifier, I don't know how applicable that would be across the board.
- Lisa Wool: maybe interviewing park maintenance crews to get an idea of all things they

seem to roughly do. There's lots of things to track, so just a general idea and rough estimates spent to average across properties.

- Julia Wakeling: do other jurisdictions have thoughts on that? Our parks maintenance team in DC was a little resistant to the idea of pulling out figures like that.
- Maggie Woodward: Maybe there's a metric we could develop to capture unmet maintenance needs, and if a site has at least X% of its maintenance needs met, it is considered "maintained"? (That might still be pretty demanding on park managers, though)

VI. Guest Speaker: CRAB (Chesapeake Region Accessible Boating) (3:00 - 3:30pm)

- Paul Bollinger, President & CEO of the Chesapeake Region Accessible Boating ([CRAB](#)) presented about the work they do on increasing accessible boating to people with disabilities across the Chesapeake Region. See key points below.

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

Materials: CRAB [Presentation Slides](#)

Key Points:

- Metropolitan region from Baltimore to DC has over 8 million people; 1+ million have some type of disability
- CRAB has 22 sailboats, a 40' Power Catamaran for guests with wheelchairs, an 18' Sea Pro center console, and 6 Dragon Force 65 radio-controlled sailboats that guests can race from the dock.
- 164 Volunteers were trained in 2026
- In 2025, CRAB served 1,755 people (61.42% of guests had a disability).
 - Partnered with 33 nonprofit organizations
- Their marina is in Back Creek, Annapolis.
- During construction, one challenge is ensuring that they are not polluting the bay. Their challenge in creating an accessible facility is that they had to disturb all of the land. The Critical Area Commission formula for fees is based on how much land you disturb, not accounting for the purpose of it or the amount of re-planting
- All power is generated through solar panels.
- Funding Sources for the Adaptive Boating Center:
 - Program Open Space Funding
 - Governor Hogan's 2019 Capital Improvement Budget
 - Waterway Improvement Grant-City of Annapolis
 - Maryland Bond Bill
 - Capital Campaign (organizational fundraising)

VII. Establishing ADA/ABA Upgrades Tracking (3:30 - 3:40pm)

- Participants discussed how the workgroup will track ADA/ABA upgrades within the data calls moving forward. The proposed option was to create a list of acceptable ADA/ABA

improvements/amenities to use as a tracking guide for such projects.

- A decision followed on whether this method of tracking ADA/ABA improvements will be used. There was no opposition to this proposal, and consensus was reached.

Requested Action: **Decisional: The proposal above was approved.**

Materials: Presentation Slides

Discussion:

- Kevin Du Bois: not a criticism of this proposal, but working on implementing an ADA water access site in my own community, and the cost is mind-boggling. I expect this will make it a challenge to add ADA improvements to sites. Maybe 40 is reasonable, but that is one challenge to keep in mind.
- Lorenzo Cinalli: I think another workplan item to consider is fully supporting jurisdictions in unlocking funding for these types of improvements.

VIII. Tracking Access to Greenspace (3:40 - 3:55pm)

- Participants continued discussion on tracking greenspace by reviewing the previously proposed tracking methods presented by Trust for Public Land in May. A decision followed on which path to take as a workgroup.
- The proposal included settling on using Option 1 for now (tracking acres of greenspace), and work on incorporating Option 3 (measuring access gaps with 10 Minute Walk Analyses) in the future. Additional work would take place to fill out the public access attribution of the Protected Lands database.

Requested Action: **Decisional. The proposal above was approved.**

Materials: Presentation Slides

Discussion:

- Cirse Gonzalez: Seems like a great strategy to pair a lower hanging fruit with the higher hanging fruit, especially as what we are really after is a benefit to the people, so tracking that people metric is going to be super important.
- Phyllis Joris: What is the timeline for development of that second metric?
 - Lorenzo Cinalli: Would depend on the jurisdiction, but would begin work on it as soon as possible.
 - Phyllis Joris: Strong preference to the second metric as a small land trust, but I realize that is harder to pull together.
- Jared Abell: TPL's parkserve data and 10 minute walk data was built primarily to support urban park analysis, and we are currently working on expanding that data to rural America over the next couple of years. Once the public access attribution within the protected lands dataset is more in place, the 10 minute walk for access could be more effectively engaged.
- Phyllis Joris: Baltimore county has on a parcel level the land use code showing which

ones are public and which are private. I would guess other jurisdictions have similar GIS data, so maybe it would not be as hard as we think? Not sure.

- Sarah D'Adamo: Supportive of this proposal. We also navigate complex access in the urban setting, with some (smaller) green spaces offering quasi-public access, or community access, rather than a park style public access. So perhaps it would be limited in the way Jared is describing.
 - Daniel Koval: This was taken into account with our definition for 'urban and community greenspaces' to go beyond just parks but also include community areas. This is our definition:
Urban and Community Greenspaces are publicly accessible lands in census-designated places and urban areas that provide opportunities for both passive and active recreation while offering exposure to nature. These public spaces deliver human health, community, and environmental benefits and include, but are not limited to, parks, trails, gardens, sports fields, waterfronts, outdoor gathering areas, and natural landscapes such as forests and grasslands.
 - Sarah D'Adamo: I know there is 10 minute walk access metric being used in Project Vital's data on Baltimore City's land (a Johns Hopkins project) but it includes vacant lots alongside green spaces
- Kevin Du Bois: Seems good to me
- Jillian Seagraves: Agreed
- Isabel Layton: I am not entirely comfortable with the second metric - 10 minute walk analysis doesn't really capture the nuance of access to greenspace in some urban areas.
 - In some cityscapes in Maryland, some might live 10 minutes from greenspace, but that doesn't mean they go to it or use it. I don't know of a great alternative, but will continue to talk with partners and see how they measure it.
- Jared Abell: I think that is a good point, but I still think it can be a useful proxy for access. Although it can sometimes tell us more about geographic proximity and not about whether someone feels comfortable or safe to make the 10 minute walk or access the site.
- Phyllis Joris: It sounds to me like we are talking about access and use, and I see those as two different things. Providing access doesn't mean it will be used; however use seems difficult to measure and the nuances with it might be difficult to take into account.
- Lorenzo Cinalli: Yes, the language agreed upon by jurisdictions is on access, rather than use. Is anyone a 1 or 2 on the consensus continuum for this proposal?
 - Cirse Gonzalez: I'm good as is
 - Jared Abell: I am as well
 - Isabel Layton: I am not enthusiastic about it, but I'll accept it.

Wrap-Up / Round Robin

(3:55 - 4:00pm)

IX. Adjourn (4:00 pm)

- **Next Meeting: Tuesday November 17th, 2-4pm**

Note: As we begin to draft management strategies and continue developing metrics for the remaining targets, there may be additional meetings scheduled throughout the summer/fall as needed.

Attendees:

Lorenzo Cinalli, DC DPR
Daniel Koval, CRC
Jared Abell, TPL
Cirse Gonzalez, CBNERR-VA
Kindle Samuel, Baltimore Greenspace
Sarah D'Adamo, Baltimore Greenspace
Phyllis Joris, Neighborspace of Baltimore County
Maggie Woodward, CBC
Julia Wakeling, DC DOEE
Kara Pennino, DC DOEE
Kelly Johnson, DC DPR
Peter Nohrden, DC DPR

Mark Morrison, PA Fish and Boat Commission
Isabel Layton, MD DNR
Jillian Seagraves, MD DNR
Lisa Wool, DE / Nanticoke Watershed Alliance
Kristal McKelvey, VA DCR
Cassie Davis, NY DEC
Jake Shoemaker, WV
Kevin Du Bois, DoW
Angela Jones, DoW
Paul Bollinger, CRAB
Sarah Brzezinski, EPA / CBPO