

## GIT Response to Management Board Decisions and Actions

### Goals Document

From January 10, 2013

- For the PSC develop an introduction to the goals document to explain the context and history of the document.
  - Done
- Fisheries GIT should reconsider the third outcome since it is not really an outcome but a strategy. An outcome should be measurable and specific (e.g. which specific fisheries and where? Just tidal or nontidal as well?)
  - The Fisheries GIT has agreed to develop a new, measurable outcome to replace this one for MB and PSC consideration. This outcome has not yet been developed.
- Habitat
  - Sally Claggett should offer agreed to language to expand the forest buffers outcome into a Forest outcome.
  - Done w/ attached goal doc
  - PA recommended revised language for the fish passage outcome for the fish passage workgroup to consider.
  - The Fisheries Goal Team entertained the suggestion but determined the current language use best captures the intended outcomes. The language referred to in PA comments has been superseded by the current language
  - PA was concerned that the stream IBI outcome was not an appropriate outcome. They felt that it should remain as an indicator, with no outcome associated with it.
  - The Stream health IBI should still be considered as an outcome but technical issues need to be addressed.
  - Lee Karr, SAV Workgroup Chair, would like to give the Management Board a presentation on SAV at a near future meeting.
  - On agenda for 2/27 MB
- Water Quality
  - Consider a Toxics Contaminant outcome (perhaps endocrine disruptors, working with Sustainable Fisheries GIT)
  - The Water Quality GIT did not reach consensus on the development of a toxics contaminant goal or outcome. Further discussion is needed.
  - Consider a water quality outcome (e.g. 60% of segments meeting water quality standards by 2025.)
  - The Water Quality GIT did not agree to develop a water quality outcome
  - Consider the wording of the 2017 outcome, whether it is “60% of practices in place” or “60% of reductions”.
  - The Water Quality GIT addressed this issue and have changed the wording for the outcome in the attached document.
  - Consider an outcome for agriculture, beginning with the EO outcome for agriculture.

- The Water Quality GIT did not agree on an outcome for agriculture. Some noted that it did not seem appropriate to develop an outcome for just one sector. Further discussion is needed.
- Healthy Watersheds
  - For the powerpoint presentation, the EO outcome most related to this goal is the stream IBI outcome.
  - This change has been incorporated in the powerpoint presentation
- Stewardship
  - Consider whether the overarching goal for stewardship be moved to a preamble rather than as a separate goal
  - Still considering move to preamble (pending development of preamble)
  - Education outcome is intended to be developed this spring
  - The wording on the Education goal has been changed to reflect the Education Workgroup's agreement. John Maounis will speak to the development of an outcome at 2/27 meeting.
- Leadership and Management
  - Consider moving goal into the preamble, adding the word "coordinate" before "management"
  - Still considering move to preamble (pending development of preamble)
- Gaps
  - Climate Change – refer to MD EO on climate change (status unknown?)
  - Adaptive management – to be considered with governance issues (in progress)
  - Toxic contaminants (See above re: WQ GIT response. CAC indicated a strong desire for the Program to pursue the development of goals and outcomes for toxics. This issue will be discussed at the next STAR meeting.