



SAV Workgroup Quarterly Meeting

Tuesday, February 24th, 2026

1:00 PM – 3:15 PM

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

Purpose: This meeting was focused solely on providing informational updates to the Submerged Aquatic Vegetation (SAV) Workgroup membership. There are no decisional items on this agenda.

Minutes

I. Welcome, Introductions & Announcements

Important Dates:

- [Small Watershed Grant](#) Deadline: *April 2*.
- [Chesapeake Watershed Investments for Landscape Defense \(WILD\)](#) Deadline: *April 9*.

II. Welcome to New GIT and Workgroup Leadership

New GIT Chairs: Kevin Schabow (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, NOAA) and Becky Gwynn (Virginia Department of Wildlife Resources, VA DWR)

New SAV Workgroup Vice Chair: Erin Shields (Chesapeake Bay National Estuarine Research Reserve – VA, Virginia Institute of Marine Science, CB NERR-VA, VIMS).

New vice chair Erin Shields provided an overview of her ongoing monitoring and research efforts focused on submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV), eelgrass resilience, and water quality across Virginia and the broader East Coast. Erin contributes to the Virginia Estuarine and Coastal Observing System, which integrates real-time and long-term water quality monitoring through fixed stations, Dataflow systems, and buoy networks. Her team maintains a public data dashboard and decision-support tools, including eelgrass heat stress applications, to track environmental conditions. At the Goodwin Islands site, SAV monitoring has been conducted since 2004, generating a robust long-term dataset that includes percent cover, shoot counts, shoot length, and depth measurements collected monthly during the growing season.

There are also several other collaborative research initiatives underway. These include reciprocal transplant experiments with the University of North Carolina (UNC) Wilmington to examine eelgrass performance and genomic variation across state lines, as well as National Park Service

(NPS) funded projects supporting eelgrass restoration and assisted migration along East Coast parks. In addition, Erin manages long-term seagrass and water quality monitoring at Assateague Island National Seashore and Colonial National Historical Park. Most recently, Erin completed and published a five-year study evaluating the interaction between oyster aquaculture operations and SAV beds, contributing new insights into aquaculture–seagrass dynamics.

Discussion:

Q: *Matt Robinson:* What is your perspective on shallow water use conflicts in this area with the aquaculture industry, permitting, etc.?

- **A:** *Erin Shields:* The purpose of the state-funded initiative was designed to evaluate whether existing aquaculture permitting requirements were overly conservative. Over five years of monitoring floating oyster aquaculture placed over eelgrass beds, the team found no long-term negative impacts. While short-term effects occurred during extremely low tides, these impacts were limited in scale. The cages covered only about 6% of the total farm footprint, and the eelgrass fully recovered by the following year. Based on these findings, the team recommended proper farm spacing as a key best management practice (BMP). However, results differed at a second farm located over a *Ruppia* (widgeon grass) and horned pondweed bed. In that case, inadequate gear maintenance, tighter spacing, and dragging cages caused direct physical damage to the vegetation. Aquaculture–SAV interactions are highly nuanced and species-specific, with outcomes strongly influenced by farm design, spacing, and gear maintenance. Management approaches should reflect these differences, as there is no one-size-fits-all solution.

Comment: *Kayla Clauson:* I'm interested in exploring the reciprocal transplant and eelgrass resilience work as a potential proof of concept for Delaware, but I would need to pursue it outside of dedicated grant funding.

- **Response:** *Erin Shields:* The research is still very new. Initial results showed that eelgrass seeds from one North Carolina (NC) site performed better than VA seeds at a VA location; however, an extreme heat event over the summer caused a complete die-off of both NC and VA plants. The team plans to revisit the site in the spring to assess recovery. NPS is facilitating seed movement among national seashores, including transfers from Assateague to Cape Lookout and Fire Island, maybe we can connect with those leading seed harvesting efforts.

Q: *Julie Reicher-Nguyen:* about the Virginia Estuarine and Coastal Observing System website, I really appreciate the centralized water quality data. Are SAV vegetation metrics also available there?

- **A:** *Erin Shields:* The platform focuses exclusively on water quality data. Vegetation and SAV monitoring data are instead managed through the National Estuarine Research Reserve System's Centralized Data Management Office, where some reserve data, including SAV and marsh datasets, can be requested. While water quality data are often accessible through multiple portals, the observing system site consolidates water quality information only and does not host SAV-specific datasets.
- **Comment from chat:** *Erika Koontz:* Here's the link Julie: [Home | Centralized Data Management Office](#)

III. [SAV Workgroup Updates](#)

Lead: Brooke Landry

Materials: SAV Workgroup Winter Quarterly Meeting Updates Presentation

Shallow Water Habitat Sentinel Site Program Workshop: Update. Two scoping workshops have been held to advance development of a Shallow Water Habitat Sentinel Site Program, with the first conducted in September 2025 over two days and the most recent held last week as a one-day session ([link](#)). Based on outcomes from these workshops and ongoing coordination, Green Fin Studio will move forward with designing the full program. The purpose of the initiative is to better understand how environmental changes and management actions influence the ecological function of shallow water habitats. This effort responds directly to recommendations from the Comprehensive Evaluation of System Response report (CESR), which emphasized the need for greater focus on shallow water systems. While the partnership has made progress reducing nitrogen, phosphorus, and sediment under the TMDL framework (Total Maximum Daily Load), improvements in living resources have not always aligned directly with those reductions, highlighting the need for a more integrated approach.

The Sentinel Site Program is intended to monitor multiple ecological and environmental indicators at the same locations to better understand how these factors interact. Parameters will include water quality, SAV, marsh habitat, fish and forage use, and contaminants, including emerging toxics. Although shallow water habitats are already monitored in various ways, these elements are not typically assessed together at the same sites. The new program aims to provide a more comprehensive understanding of habitat functionality and responses to management actions under the Beyond 2025 framework. For the purpose of this program, the definition of shallow water habitat includes tidal waters and marshes of the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries down to a depth of 5 meters (m), ensuring consistency and inclusivity in monitoring design.

The Sentinel Site Program envisions multiple monitoring teams working collaboratively at designated locations. Each site would begin with a comprehensive physical assessment, including sediment characterization and bathymetric mapping, to document baseline habitat conditions. This initial survey would determine site features such as whether marsh transitions into SAV beds or whether shoreline development limits habitat extent. These physical parameters would likely be reassessed on a longer-term cycle, such as every 5 years. All collected data would feed into a centralized database to support integration and analysis. The final deliverable will be a comprehensive guidance document outlining recommended site locations, monitoring parameters, standardized protocols, and data sheets tailored to specific monitoring components, including physical habitat, water quality, SAV, and fisheries. Although the guidance will position the partnership for implementation, substantial work will remain to secure funding and coordinate program rollout.

SAV Monitoring in Chesapeake Bay – VIMS Bay-wide Aerial Survey (Tier I). CBP employs a hierarchical, three-tiered monitoring framework, with Tier 1 consisting of the long-running baywide aerial survey conducted by VIMS since 1984. Final 2024 mapping results show 83,250 acres of SAV, representing a negligible decrease from 2023 levels. This acreage equates to 64% of the 130,000-acre restoration target and 45% of the 185,000-acre long-term goal established under the 2014 Bay Agreement. Overall, SAV coverage reflects a 114% increase from the 38,958 acres mapped in 1984. As the partnership transitions to new interim and long-term restoration goals, we should consider reporting 2025 data against the existing benchmarks or shift to the new targets – either approach is feasible since the change affects only the benchmark reference line, not the underlying data.

SAV Watchers Program (Tier II). SAV Watcher trainings are typically one- or two-day events that begin with a classroom session covering SAV ecology and monitoring importance, followed by a field component where participants collect data in the water. Volunteers who pass an assessment at the end of the training are certified as SAV Watcher trainers and may then train additional

volunteers within their communities. Participants often include riverkeepers, watershed groups, educators, and community leaders. While not all certified individuals establish volunteer monitoring programs, many contribute data independently. For the 2026 field season, planned training events include Havre de Grace (Susquehanna Flats), Washington College (Chesapeake Semester students), and expanded efforts in VA in coordination with The Nature Conservancy and Virginia Commonwealth University's Rice Rivers Center. Additional events are anticipated at the Eastern Shore Laboratory and Mallows Bay, along with potential expansion into MD and VA coastal bays. The program continues to grow geographically and provides valuable ground-truthing data to complement the annual aerial SAV survey. Participants can receive updates through a quarterly newsletter and register for trainings via Eventbrite or the program website.

Tier III: SAV Sentinel Site Program. Monitoring is led primarily by MD Department of Natural Resources (MD DNR) staff in partnership with VIMS CNERR sites in MD and VA, St. Mary's College of Maryland, and trained local partners such as a nature center in Dundee Creek. Active sites currently include locations such as Marshy Creek, Smith Island, Susquehanna Flats, the Severn River, and others, with potential additions planned for the upcoming season. Where feasible, new SAV Sentinel Sites (SAVSS) will be co-located with proposed Shallow Water Habitat Sentinel Sites (SWHSS) to enhance integration. Although SAV Sentinel data are not yet housed in a centralized database, datasets are organized internally and available upon request, with the long-term goal of incorporating them into a unified data management system.

Beyond 2025 and the Updated Chesapeake Bay Agreement: Update. SAV now falls within Thriving Habitat, Fisheries & Wildlife Goal, alongside outcomes related to blue crab, brook trout, fish habitat and passage, oysters, stream health, and wetlands. The updated SAV outcome is to sustain and increase habitat and ecosystem benefits of submerged aquatic vegetation and achieve a long-term target of 196,600 acres baywide, a higher goal than the previous 185,000-acre benchmark. This revised target aligns with updated water quality standards and improved segment-level analyses, and it now formally incorporates salinity zone-specific targets. Interim milestones include 90,000 acres by 2030, 95,000 acres by 2035, and 100,000 acres by 2040. Although these shorter-term targets may appear less aspirational than earlier benchmarks, they are grounded in recent long-term trend projections. The facilitator emphasized that while interim targets reflect current trajectory realities, the ultimate long-term goal represents an ambitious and necessary endpoint for a restored Bay.

SAV Mitigation and Monitoring Guidance Document. This resource is intended to support regulatory agencies by outlining ecologically defensible, realistic, and effective approaches to SAV mitigation when required. The guidance was developed through dedicated workshops and has now been posted to the [SAV Workgroup webpage here](#) and distributed to regulatory partners.

Important Dates here (slide 28).

Discussion:

***Comment from chat:** Kevin Schabow:* Here's the Comprehensive Evaluation of System Response (CESR) report Brooke referenced ([link](#)).

***Comment:** David Wilcox:* The choice of tidal data is important, differences between sea level and mean lower low water can amount to approximately 1m, which could significantly affect how the definition is applied. Adding the tidal reference to the shallow water habitat definition could avoid confusion during implementation.

Q from chat: *Matt Robinson:* Any reason why there are some missing from the northern neck? Also, what about one in the Anacostia? There's also considerable restoration that has gone on in the Pocomoke River. Wondering if a site off the mouth might make sense?

- **A from chat:** *Erika Koontz:* During the workshop last week, we did talk about adding a site in the Anacostia!
- **A:** *Brooke Landry:* the current map of potential Sentinel Sites is preliminary and not exhaustive. There was no specific reason for omissions in areas such as the Northern Neck, and inclusion of sites in the Anacostia and Potomac River is still possible. The initial scoping workshops focused primarily on existing Chesapeake Bay sentinel and nearshore monitoring locations, and time constraints limited the inclusion of all potential programs. Site selection remains open for refinement and members can still submit additional recommendations for consideration as the program continues to evolve.
- **Response from chat:** *Matt Robinson:* Always a lot going on in the Anacostia but maybe some of the SAV restoration sites could work. Maybe reach out to Jonthan Champion at District of Columbia Department of Energy and Environment (DOEE).

Comment: *Julie Reichert-Nguyen:* I strongly support the development of the Sentinel Site Program and the most critical component is the creation of a centralized database. When I supported fisheries-related environmental change projects, the absence of a central data repository significantly delays analysis and management decisions, sometimes requiring up to a year just to compile datasets before analysis can begin. Repeated data access challenges and limited sharing agreements further complicate forecasting, modeling, and timely decision-making. A well-designed central database would greatly enhance the ability to assess environmental change, support predictive modeling, and inform adaptive management across the partnership.

- **Response:** *Brooke Landry:* The database is a vital element of the program. A review of approximately 27 potential platform options identified the Chesapeake Monitoring Cooperative portal as a leading candidate. Discussions are underway with partners, including Liz and Dave, to explore how an expanded or adapted framework could support the Sentinel Site Program's comprehensive, multi-parameter monitoring needs. However, the development and implementation of such a database will require dedicated funding. For now, the team is identifying viable platform options before pursuing resources to build and operationalize the system, recognizing that the central database will ultimately serve as the core of the program's design and functionality.
- **Comment from chat:** *Erika Koontz:* If you're curious, CMC's data exploration platform: [CMC Data Explorer](#)
- **Comment:** *Chris Guy:* the centralized database is a critical component of the Sentinel Site Program, and the infrastructure may already exist within the Chesapeake Bay Program (CBP). The database development requires staff time and resources, but the partnership currently maintains data systems, like Thriving Habitat. They could potentially house or integrate the Sentinel Site data. Rather than assuming that new competitive funding and an entirely new platform are required, we can explore whether existing in-house capacity could support the effort, potentially making implementation a lighter lift.

- **Comment:** *Peter Tango:* maybe we can consider elevating the discussion to the new Goal Implementation Team (GIT) leadership structure once it is fully established. Given that the Sentinel Site Program is highly cross-cutting and would engage multiple GITs, it may be well-suited for coordinated oversight within the Bay Program's governance framework. Although no commitments were made and governance structures are still being formalized, this initiative could be a strong candidate for cross-program collaboration.
 - **Response from chat:** *Emily Young:* Benthic monitoring data and water quality data would fit so easily into our existing databases. Happy to further this conversation with anyone interested!
 - **Response from chat:** *Peter Tango:* We seem to need a discussion or two about what is needed to go forward, creating guidance on templates for the databases such that they talk to each other or create the Vortex that pulls the information in upon delivery into one place seamlessly. Also need the QA/metadata support, etc. I'll work with Brooke et al for us to set up such discussions.

Q from chat: *Magdalene Ngeve:* Brooke, this looks great!! And thanks for clarifying how the shallow water habitat sentinel sites differ from the SAV sentinel sites. How do you anticipate both SWHSS and SAVSS will be synergized for overall habitat management support?

- **A:** *Brooke Landry:* The SAV Sentinel Sites are already in place and have been actively monitored for the past two to three years, building on a longer history of SAV monitoring. VIMS maintains approximately 27 long-term SAV monitoring sites in VA, while MD manages its own SAV Sentinel data. However, as previously noted, there is currently no centralized database that integrates these datasets across jurisdictions, reinforcing the importance of developing a unified data management system. Some existing SAV SS may be expanded into SWHSS by co-locating additional monitoring components, such as fish and other living resources. Early discussions about adding fisheries monitoring at SAV sites helped catalyze the broader concept of monitoring multiple ecological parameters at the same locations. However, not all SAVSS will become SWHSS, and vice versa. The broader initiative is intended to evaluate multiple habitat components and ecological functions, with SAV representing just one of several key resources being assessed.

Q: *Kevin Schabow:* How might the proposed Sentinel Site Program align with a related effort led by NOAA and EPA, the Living Resource Priority Areas Assessment. That project aims to identify high-value living resource areas and explore how targeted water quality and land-based management actions could deliver the greatest ecological return on investment. There are clear parallels between the two initiatives. How might they complement one another?

- **A:** *Brooke Landry:* The Living Resource Priority Areas Assessment was introduced during the first Sentinel Site workshop, and follow-up discussions have taken place to better understand how habitat segments are being categorized. The alignment between the two efforts will likely depend on timing and program development, but there is strong potential for integration. Sentinel Sites could provide detailed, site-specific ecological

monitoring, while the priority areas assessment could help guide where strategic management actions would be most impactful. Both initiatives share a common goal of linking habitat condition, management actions, and ecological outcomes in a more coordinated and data-driven way.

- **Response from chat:** *Matt Robinson:* VIMS is currently working on developing habitat suitability indices for croaker, white perch, and juvenile striped bass for all 92 segments.

Q from chat: *Julie Reichert-Nguyen:* Is there a workshop report that shows the results of the scoring that was shown in the presentation?

- **A from chat:** *Nick Staten:* The presentation is here ([link](#)), you could zoom into the pictures. I do not think Green Fin has prepared a report but Brooke may be able to send you resources.

Comment: *David Wilcox:* Transitioning to new SAV restoration benchmarks could create confusion. I recommend a clear communication strategy. Maybe reporting platforms include an option to toggle between the existing and new benchmarks during the transition period, allowing users to see both reference points while maintaining consistency.

- **Response:** *Brooke Landry:* A transition plan is needed – while benchmarks may change, the underlying data remain the same and the narrative accompanying the indicators provides an opportunity to clearly explain progress. Benchmark changes cascade to state-level goals and salinity zone-specific targets, which are now formally incorporated into reporting frameworks such as Chesapeake Progress.

IV. Current Funding Opportunities

Lead: *Kristen Saucke Blunk (Headwaters LLC)*

Three grant programs are currently active: the Innovative Nutrient and Sediment Reduction (INSR) Program, the Small Watershed Grants (SWG) Program, and the Chesapeake WILD Grant Program (Watershed Investments for Landscape Defense). Historically, SAV has not been a major investment focus for National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF), largely due to alignment with the Chesapeake Bay Business Plan. However, as 2025 concludes, NFWF is transitioning to a “Next Generation” business planning framework that emphasizes regional species of greatest conservation need and habitat priorities. This shift, combined with alignment under the new Chesapeake Bay Agreement, will create stronger opportunities for SAV and habitat-focused projects moving forward.

The INSR program’s pre-proposal deadline has passed, with more than 30 submissions received and invitations for full proposals forthcoming. The Small Watershed Grants and Chesapeake WILD programs remain open, with early April deadlines. The Small Watershed Grants program offers both Planning and Technical Assistance (PTA) and Implementation grants and is often the most accessible entry point for water quality or Bay Agreement-aligned projects, especially for applicants seeking initial funding. Chesapeake WILD, funded through the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Department of the Interior, continues to generate strong interest. These programs provide multiple pathways for collaborative, habitat-aligned restoration efforts.

Discussion:

Q: *Brooke Landry:* Can you use these granting programs to fund research or is it only conservation restoration projects?

- **A:** *Kristen Saacke Blunk:* Research can be included but typically must be framed within the context of advancing on-the-ground implementation. While PTA grants may support research elements, proposals generally need to demonstrate how findings will support future restoration or management outcomes. Also consider volunteering for proposal review panels, serving as a reviewer provides valuable insight into how funding decisions are made and helps strengthen future proposal development.
- **Comment:** *Chris Guy:* We previously have had challenges with SAV restoration proposals, including perceptions that reviewers have historically favored projects with clearer or more predictable outcomes, such as forest or wetland restoration.

Comment: *Brooke Landry:* Its important to coordinate within the WG if members plan to submit proposals to avoid conflicts of interest between applicants and reviewers. Some project ideas include establishing a commercial seed supply, and developing SAV restoration training programs through community colleges to expand restoration workforce capacity.

- **Comment:** *Chris Guy:* We should also leverage partnerships and creative funding strategies. Federal partners such as National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) can sometimes provide matching funds for grant proposals, strengthening applications. Additional funding sources such as the Department of Defense's REPI (Readiness and Environmental Protection Integration) program is another potential opportunity for restoration projects that can be linked to military installation resilience or recreation benefits.

Q from chat: *Nick Staten:* I wonder if this could fund implementation of a commercial seed source or say a shallow water sentinel site program.

- **A from chat:** *Kristen Saacke Blunk:* Yes, I think that would be an eligible activity. NFWF works closely with the CMC on monitoring Re: to restoration sites. Seed source more so than sentinel site program.

V. Member Updates

Lead: *Erin Shields*

Cathy Wazniak: over the last few years we have been sampling benthic algal mats. In these mats we have detected saxitoxin, and they often occur in conjunction with SAV beds. We also see similar mats in fresher waters, such as the Shenandoah and Upper Potomac. These mats can produce potent neurotoxins. We have been working with the SAV Watchers program to add a simple reporting field so that volunteers can note when they see these benthic mats. This helps us estimate their abundance and distribution. If you encounter these mats during sampling, please consider noting them on your data sheets. If you are able to collect samples, we would be happy to work with you to identify them and, if possible, test them for toxins so we can improve our understanding of their spatial distribution.

David Wilcox: Chris Patrick is preparing for an upcoming benthic meeting. There are many interesting talks scheduled and a lot of work from our group will be presented there.

Nancy Rybicki: Currently, there are reports of *Trapa bispinosa* in eleven counties in VA, including Albemarle, Fairfax, Prince William, Fauquier, Loudoun, Orange, and Charlotte counties. Some of

these counties indicate that the distribution is expanding geographically. In Maryland, it has now been documented in Prince George's and Montgomery counties. Altogether, we have records from approximately eleven counties and about 175 confirmed colonies where water chestnut has been observed. Most of these colonies occur in impounded water bodies, such as ponds. Only one known *Trapa bispinosa* population has been recorded in tidal waters and that population was removed. We do not currently see it in tidal waters, but there is no reason it could not spread there. One mechanism for spread is via Canada geese. The seeds can hitchhike on the birds as they move from one pond to another, and then the plants can disperse downstream from ponds or impoundments through flowing water. At present, about 70% of the colonies occur in Fairfax County and about 20% occur in Prince William County. By 2024, roughly 60–80% of known colonies were actively managed by agencies or local organizations. The VA Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services manages about 80 ponds, often providing assistance to private landowners at no cost. The VA Soil and Water Conservation District manages approximately 21 ponds, while Fairfax County Stormwater and Public Works manages several others. In addition, some homeowner associations manage ponds independently. Our hope is that these efforts will help curb the spread and prevent the plant from reaching tidal waters. Right now I am working on compiling all of these observations into a single database so we can summarize which water bodies are managed, which are unmanaged, and where the plant has been eradicated. Some sites have been managed for three years or longer, so we should soon have a clearer update on their status.

- **Comment from chat:** Nancy Rybicki: *Trapa bispinosa* distribution: USGS ([link](#)).
- **Q:** David Wilcox: is the USGS Nonindigenous Aquatic Species map currently up to date? At the moment, do we have any colonies in tidal waters large enough to be detected from aerial surveys?
- **A:** Nancy Rybicki: It is current through 2024. However, we had many additional observations in 2025. The VA Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services recently sent those reports to me, and I am currently working to add them to the USGS database. Many of the observations are already included, but I want to enter every record so that repeated observations are documented. That way we can build a timeline showing changes in percent abundance at each site. For *Trapa bispinosa* specifically, we do not currently have colonies in tidal waters that large.
- **Comment from chat:** Zack Kelleher: For the past 3 years we've pulled less than 100 pounds of *Trapa natans* out of the Sassafra each summer (compared to 4,000+lbs in 2019)

VI. Adjourn

Next Meeting: Tuesday, May 7th, 2026 from 1-5PM

Attendees:

- Brooke Landry, MDDNR
- Nick Staten, CRC
- Kristen Saacke Blunk, NFWF
- Kaitlin Scowen, MD DNR

- Megan Fitzgerald, EPA
- Erin Shields, VIMS
- Peter Tango, USGS
- Stephanie Hall, MDDNR
- Erika Koontz, MDDNR
- Julie Reichert-Nguyen, NOAA
- Bob Murphy, TetraTech
- Chris Guy, USFWS
- Erin Shields, VIMS
- Gwynn Becky, DWR
- Kevin Shacbow, NOAA
- Becky Golden, ShoreRivers
- Brady Bayne, Gunpowder Riverkeeper
- Carl Friedrichs, VIMS
- Cathy Wazniak, MD DNR
- Kayla Clauson, DNREC
- Emily Young, ICPRB
- Megan Fitzgerald, EPA
- Gabriel Duran, CRC
- Hannah Claggett, UMCES
- Jason,
- Joe, MD CoE
- Johnathan Watson, NOAA
- Justin Murray, Havre de Grace Environmental Center
- Kaitlin Scowen, MDDNR
- Kati Booth, The Nature Conservancy
- Susan Lamont, Anne Arundel Community College
- Megan Spindler, USACE
- Magdalene Ngeve, UMCES
- Rachel Beall, Arundel Rivers Federation
- Rebecca Swerida, MDDNR
- Tish Robertson, VADEQ
- Matthew Robinson, EPA
- Nancy Rybicki, USGS (retired) and GMU
- Kelly Somers, EPA
- David Wilcox, VIMS
- Zack Kelleher, Sassafras Riverkeeper
- Mike Johnson, VA MRC
- Cynthia Johnson, VADEQ