Chesapeake Bay Program
Maintain Healthy Watersheds Goal Implementation Team
Meeting Minutes
June 12th, 2014 10 A.M. – 3 P.M.
State Arboretum of Virginia at Blandy Experimental Farm

Meeting Participants:
Mark Bryer (TNC), *Chair*
Jason Dubow (Maryland Department of Planning), *Vice-Chair*
Renee Thompson (USGS), *Coordinator*
Tuana Phillips (Chesapeake Research Consortium), *Staff*
Bevin Buchheister (Chesapeake Bay Commission)
LJ Ingram (Chart, LLC)
Kevin Anderson (Trout Unlimited)
Julie Walker (Chesapeake Research Consortium)
Mike Slattery (USFWS)
Donnelle Keech (TNC)
Diane Wilson (Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection)
Wink Hastings (NPS)
Lee Epstein (Chesapeake Bay Foundation)
Owen McDonough (EPA Healthy Watersheds Program)
John Wolf (USGS)
Gene Yagow (Virginia Tech)
Helen Stewart (Maryland Department of Natural Resources)
Anne Hariston-Strang (Maryland Department of Natural Resources)
Lori Mohr (Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection)
Amanda Pruzinsky (Chesapeake Research Consortium)
John Schneider (Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control)
Todd Janeski (Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation)
Hannah Martin (Chesapeake Research Consortium)
Jennifer Greiner (USFWS)

Meeting Summary:
The Chesapeake Bay Program's Maintain Healthy Watersheds Goat Implementation Team (GIT) met on June 12th, 2014 at the State Arboretum of Virginia on the University of Virginia's Blandy Experimental Farm. At the start of this meeting, members heard about the Virginia Arboretum and Bland Experimental Farm and shared updates on topics related to past and upcoming conferences, as well as RCPP opportunities. Mark Bryer gave an overview of the status and work behind the 2014 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement. Furthermore, members heard reports from the GIT's two new workgroups and listened to a presentation from a Natural Resource Planner in Clarke County, VA. The rest of the meeting time was used to hear from the Coordinators of the Protect and Restore Vital Habitats and Foster Chesapeake Stewardship GITs, and to discuss management strategies, cross-GIT collaboration opportunities, and funding ideas.

About the Meeting Location:
The Arboretum takes up 185 of the 500 acres that make up the Farm. Located near the Shenandoah River, much of the work on the Farm involves ecology and environmental field research. The Farm is also a former slave owning property. For more information about the Arboretum and Farm:
- http://blandy.virginia.edu/arboretum

Summary of Meeting Action Items:
- GIT leaders will contact state representatives to discuss updating and finalizing the map of State-identified healthy waters and watersheds.
- The Local Engagement and Tracking Workgroups will meet again in the near future.
- In the future we will attempt to refer to ourselves and other GITs by their full names or abbreviated description names, e.g., Healthy Watersheds, Habitat, Stewardship, etc.
- Tuana will share the healthy watershed session ideas that were generated during the Watershed Forum planning phone call with the rest of the Goal Team and ask for input.
- Donnelle will continue to facilitate discussions on healthy watershed session ideas for the Watershed Forum.
- Tuana will make the MET Land Conservation Conference's Healthy Watershed PowerPoint presentations available on the GIT's webpage.
- Tuana will locate information on the NE geomorphic resiliency layer presentation from a previous meeting, to be looked over by the Tracking Workgroup.
- The Tracking Ad-Hoc Group name will be changed to Tracking Workgroup on the Chesapeake Bay Program website and on other documents.
- The GIT will seek a representative to get involved with the Protect and Restore Vital Habitat GIT's Stream Health Workgroup.
- The GIT will follow-up on the various map layer overlap ideas, among other ideas generated during this meeting, for management strategy development as well as consideration by the Tracking workgroup.
- Tuana will share the STAC Workshop Report, "Designing Sustainable Coastal Habitats," with Healthy Watershed Goal Team members.
- The document of GIT funding project ideas will be distributed to the entire goal team for input. The Habitat and Fisheries GITs' ideas will also be distributed.

Updates:
- Chesapeake Watershed Forum Planning:
  - The 9th Annual Watershed Forum is taking place September 26th – 28th at the National Conservation Training Center in Shepherdstown, VA. The theme for the Forum is "Making the Connection – Engaging Everyone in Watershed Protection." Presentation proposals are being accepted until June 27th.

- o Donnelle Keech (TNC) is on the Forum's Conservation and Preservation Track Planning Team. Donnelle and several other Local Engagement Workgroup members recently met on the phone to brainstorm a number of session ideas for this track. There may be another session this year on an overview of the GITs efforts to maintain healthy watersheds.
  Action item: Share the ideas that were generated during the phone call with the rest of the Goal Team and ask for input.
  Action item: Have another conference call to discuss ideas.
- April 3rd – 4th 2014 MET Land Conservation Conference:
  - o The 14th Annual conference was held in the Claggett Center in Adamstown, Maryland. Over 200 participants from all over the Chesapeake Bay Region attended. More than 115 organizations were represented, including over 30 land trusts.
  - o Select GIT members from TNC, CBC, EPA Healthy Watersheds, MDNR, and USFWS helped put together 3 sessions related to healthy watersheds:
    1) *Crediting Land Conservation in the TMDL*
    2) *The Land Water Connection: science to make your case for land conservation (Part 1: Maintaining Maryland's Healthy Watersheds)*
    3) *Part 2: Conserving Maryland's Healthy Watersheds* - an overview of EPA's Healthy Watersheds Program, the Maintain Healthy Watersheds GIT, Maryland's healthy watersheds initiatives, and funding opportunities for protecting healthy watersheds. For the latter presentation, Dan Murphy (USFW) created a useful document on funding healthy water protection, which can be found at the following link:
       - o http://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/21726/funding_healthy_watershed_protection_dan_murphy_met_conference.pdf
  Action item: Make the conference PowerPoint presentations available on the GIT's webpage.
- Kevin Anderson (TU) briefed the group on NRCS's Regional Conservation Program (RCPP) opportunity. TU hopes to implement projects in healthy watersheds and partner with other organizations to bring the work to the scale they are working toward. USDA is asking for proposals that are innovative and different than proposals in the past, and encourages proposals that involve multi-partner or multi-state work and engage with industry. Approximately 400 million dollars are being allocated in three different pot categories: State, Critical Conservation, and National. There are 8 Critical Conservation areas in the country, and the Chesapeake Bay region is one of them. While there is no match requirement, there is a preference to leverage other dollars. Pre-proposals are due July 14th. For more information:
  - o http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/main/national/programs/farmbill/rcpp/
- Related to the RCPP opportunities, Bevin Buchheister shared that the Chesapeake Bay Commission is convening meetings of interested parties, including non-profits and states. NFWF is planning to develop a broad proposal that targets three agricultural hot spots in the watershed, and is looking for partners.

- Owen McDonough (EPA's Healthy Watersheds Program) announced that the Wisconsin Integrated Assessment of Watershed Health was released this March. For a link to the final report:
  - http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/Watersheds/documents/HWA/WiHWreport.pdf

  Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources has a created a website page devoted to implementing the results, and is developing a web viewer for holistic maps of vulnerability. For a link to this website:
  - http://dnr.wi.gov/topic/Watersheds/HWA.html

Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement

Mark Bryer updated the group on the status of the new Agreement and upcoming Executive Council meeting.

- The Governors of Maryland, Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Delaware, D.C. Mayor, EPA Administrator, Chesapeake Bay Commission Chair, and West Virginia Environmental Protection Director will meet on Monday, June 16th in Annapolis, MD to sign the new Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement.
- There are several hallmarks to celebrate with the signing of this agreement:
  - For the first time, the headwater states of NY, WV, and DE are signatories.
  - This is also the first time healthy watersheds is addressed in an agreement.
  - The agreement has an adaptive framework which gives the GITs great latitude and the opportunity to be adaptive as we move forward.
- The public comment period from January to March 2014 helped make the agreement stronger. More than 2,400 comments were received. For a summary of comments related to healthy watersheds, please see slides 3 and 4 on the PowerPoint presentation available at:
  - http://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/21726/meeting_slides_-_maintain_healthy_watersheds_june_2014.pdf
- As a result of the public and stakeholder comments, as well as discussions among the GIT leaders and select members, the GIT revised its Maintain Healthy Watersheds Goal and Outcome statements. The word change is subtle but significant. The revised language is now stronger and clearer:
  - **Goal: Sustain state-identified healthy waters and watersheds, recognized for their ~~exceptional~~ high quality and/or high ecological value.**
  - **Outcome: ~~By 2025,~~ 100% of state-identified currently healthy waters and watersheds remain healthy.**
- Mike Slattery (USFWS) brought up USFWS's and TNC's northeast geomorphic resiliency layer that could be integrated with the Maintain Healthy Watersheds GIT work. A presentation on this project at a future GIT meeting might be a good idea. The project will finalized in the next month. There was already presentation to the GIT on this project over a year ago.
  Action item: Tuana will locate information on this from the previous meeting and the Tracking workgroup will investigate this data.
- Mark reviewed the status of the state-identified healthy waters and watersheds map:

- o Maintain Healthy Watersheds GIT staff are in the process of contacting GIT state representatives to discuss the possibility of updating and finalizing the map of state-identified healthy waters and watersheds for a baseline of current conditions.
- o As we undertake this process, we recognize that we want to be able to be adaptive, in order to incorporate potential new healthy waters and watersheds as they are identified. For example, West Virginia may expand its list of healthy watersheds beyond just its Tier 3 waters, and is convening a group to investigate the creation of a healthy watershed tracking framework later this year.
- o For more information on the current map and how states identify their healthy waters and watersheds, please see the ChesapeakeStat website: http://stat.chesapeakebay.net/?q=node/131

Report from Tracking Ad-Hoc Group:
Mark provided some context for the GIT by reminding members of the GIT's two newly formed Workgroups: Local Engagement Work Group and Tracking Ad-Hoc Group. He clarified that the two Workgroups will work independently to advance the GIT's work, and will present recommendations to the full GIT at GIT meetings to give everyone around the table an opportunity to provide feedback.

- • Members agreed that changing the Tracking Ad-Hoc group's name to Tracking *Workgroup* would be a better fit considering the nature and role of the group.
  Action item: Change the Tracking Ad-Hoc Group name to Tracking Workgroup on the Chesapeake Bay Program website and other documents.

Renee Thompson reviewed the purpose of the Tracking Workgroup: to develop a method to track and report watershed health and protection. She also provided an update on the workgroup's first conference call:

- • GIT members from West Virginia, Delaware, Maryland, TU, USGS, and EPA Healthy Watersheds participated in the conference call.
- • Participants provided a lot of feedback on the group's four legged framework, which can be found on the Tracking Workgroup's vision document:
  - o http://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/21776/trackingworkgroup_description_final.pdf
- • For a link to the meeting minutes:
  - o http://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/21776/tracking_workgroup_052714_conf_call_minutes_final.pdf
- • Other Discussion Points:
  - o Mike Slattery shared that New York and partners are working on a model for Trout restoration. The model includes an element of threat analysis, but is focused on brook trout. The preliminary model will be available this summer. This data may be useful to augment the no known impact data that NY currently uses for its state-identified healthy watersheds.
- • Renee reviewed the Workgroup's Guiding Principles and Recommendations:
  - o Establishing a baseline for Healthy Waters and Watersheds is essential for moving forward.

- New watersheds as they become healthy can be added to the tracking list/map. The Workgroup recommends developing a process to do that.
- The focus of the Workgroup will be to measure progress in terms of available data, indicators, identify gaps, as well as to investigate the presence of policies, recognizing that it is not possible to comprehensively track land use policies or protective zoning across the watershed.
- Efforts will be made not to duplicate efforts or add additional reporting burdens on to the states.
- GIT members recognized that, in regards to bullet three under the guiding principles and recommendations, investigating the presence of land use and protective zoning policies is relevant to the Local Engagement Workgroup's work as well.
- It was noted that even if a healthy watershed has an easement, it doesn't mean it is fully protected. Gas and energy development have other rights.
  - For this reason, it is important to identify the land trusts working in healthy watersheds with easements, because they are responsible for monitoring those lands.
- The following question was brought up: How can we presume that 100% of healthy watersheds are maintained?
  - This might be an interesting topic to discuss with the Stewardship GIT and Local Government Advisory Committee.
- Road density data is available, and may be useful for the Workgroup.
- The Workgroup has the opportunity to identify gaps in information we need. The group may collaborate with the Bay Program's Scientific, Technical Assessment and Reporting (STAR) group to identify the different data needs and sources.

Report from Local Engagement Workgroup
Donnelle Keech provided an update on the Local Engagement Workgroup's charge and first conference call:
- Charge: The Workgroup will use the Maintain Healthy Watershed Goal Team's roles as aggregators, supporters, and conveners to build capacity for local actors and help further watershed and water protection at the local level.
- Members from Maryland, USFWS, Chesapeake Bay Trust, Land Trust Alliance, Local Government Advisory Committee, and Chesapeake Bay Commission participated in the first conference call.
- During the call, the workgroup reviewed the GIT's Goal and Outcome statements, examined the situation we seek to change, generated initial ideas, and discussed local engagement as a strategy, what works and what doesn't work, as well as the workgroup's and Bay Program's roles.
- For a link to the meeting minutes:
  - http://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/21634/localengagementworkgroup_description_final_2.pdf

Donnelle reviewed the Workgroup's assumptions for the situation we seek to change:
- Cumulative impact of land use change = primary threat to healthy watersheds.
- Land use change is driven by local decisions and factors.
- The status quo is loss of healthy watersheds.

- To get the change we want: "local engagement."

GIT members shared their thoughts on the above assumptions:

- It was pointed out that land use change is often, but not always, driven by local decisions. Some decisions, especially those with regard to energy development, can be driven at the state or federal level. Federal lands make up 5% of the watershed.
- The development community also plays a large role in land use changes.
- Not all land use change is a threat. Instead, how the land is managed is more important.
- Land use change is driven by politicians and by the economy too.
- One group Pennsylvania is not considering is the Amish – we need to think out of the box about local engagement.
- Biophysical and other factors may also play a role in degradation of healthy watersheds.
- We should not judge local communities who are seeking to be engaged. We should be more humble and understanding about the way local communities view their position in the overall effort to undertake watershed transformation.
- Locals have priorities over features. Communicating that a beautiful looking forest is more than just a beautiful looking forest is important to protecting healthy watersheds.
- We can now move forward with the understanding that the primary threats and drivers of healthy watershed loss are complex, but we have a basic agreement of the core elements.
- Local engagement is seen as an intervention. We have a big assumption of what we think local engagement means: "build capacity for local actors."
- There are many resources available for local actors. We are looking to identify a community to do something different.
- Efforts will be community-dependent. We cannot simply wave a one-solution wand over the entire watershed.
- A lot of local engagement work is related to stormwater reductions and fixing problems, not so much on protection.

Donnelle reviewed the initial workgroup questions and next steps.

Initial questions:

- Who are the Bay's leaders (organizations, individuals) in local engagement – what are they doing, where are they focusing, what needs have they identified?
- What are other GITs doing on local engagement?
- How do strengths and capacity of CBP and Healthy Watersheds GIT position us to join these efforts? What does this GIT have that is unique to add to efforts?

Next steps:

- Recruit new members who are missing from the table.
- Identify/assess our skills/abilities to build local capacity.
- Reach out to ongoing efforts related to local [engagement – does this mean identifying those organizations building capacity for sustaining healthy watersheds?]
- Hone in on some concrete ideas and actions.

- Can we as folks if it makes sense to identify priority healthy watersheds to identify locales most important to assist/support?
- Another area that might be relatively easy for CBPO to assist is… once a locale decides to work on a high priority healthy watershed, CBPO does a quick suitability analysis for the watershed to delineate critical lands to protect and areas where future growth would have the least adverse effects on the watershed.

After lunch, Mark noted that the "GIT4" nickname and in general the reference to GITs by numbers is confusing. In the future we will attempt to refer to ourselves and other GITs by their full names or abbreviated description names, e.g., Healthy Watersheds, Habitat, Stewardship, etc.

Cross-GIT Coordination and Collaboration
The success of the GIT's outcome where, 100% of State-identified currently healthy waters and watersheds remain healthy, will require a great deal of coordination with partners. Amy Handen (The Foster Chesapeake Stewardship GIT Coordinator) presented on the Stewardship GIT's outcomes and goals and outlined their overlapping elements with the healthy watersheds goal and outcome. The Stewardship GIT's goals and outcomes address conserving lands, citizen stewardship, public access, and environmental literacy. The GIT is also involved with the Large Landscape Partnership Initiative and Landscope. They are currently overhauling their platform to provide another, more robust data visualization source through Landscope.
For more information on the Large Landscape Initiative:
- http://www.nps.gov/chba/parknews/landscape-conservation.htm
For more information on Landscope:
- http://www.landscope.org/chesapeake
For a link to Amy's presentation and more information:
- http://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/21726/git_4_pres_handen.pdf

Other discussion points and questions:
- Question: Tracking protection is important for both the Stewardship and Healthy Watersheds GITs. How are protected lands tracked? Is there an annual process for collecting data from states?
  - The data is collected biennially in the beginning of the year and includes data through December of the preceding year. Data might be missing from small counties and land trusts. In addition, there is a bit of a time lag issue as some parcels are not digitized into GIS for several months/years. Standardization of attributes contained in the data is also a problem, although there is an effort to standardize formats through the Landscope process.
- It was noted that the Stewardship and Healthy Watersheds GITS are reaching out to the same people and partners to engage in conversations related to local engagement and citizen stewardship, etc.

- The map layer of protected lands is shown on the map of State-identified healthy waters and watersheds. It might be a good idea to also include priority areas for protection.

Jennifer Greiner (Protect and Restore Vital Habitats GIT Coordinator) presented on the Habitat GIT's outcomes and goals and outlined their overlapping elements with the healthy watersheds goal and outcome. The Habitat GIT's mission includes restoration as well as protection. The GIT has 8 habitat outcomes, 4 of which relate to healthy watersheds: Stream health, brook trout, wetlands, and forest buffers.
For a link to Jennifer's presentation and more information:
- http://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/21726/greiner_hwgit_june2014.pdf

Other discussion points and questions:
- The Healthy Watersheds GIT should engage with the Habitat GIT's Stream Health Workgroup to help identify "almost" healthy streams. In addition, during the Healthy Watershed's GIT first year of existence, members spent a lot of time figuring out how to measure health. Looking at some of this past work might be useful for the Stream Health Workgroup.
  Action item: Seek a representative from Healthy Watersheds GIT to get involved with the Stream Health Workgroup.
- Question: The Stream Health goal, "Continually improve stream health and function throughout the watershed. Improve health and function of 10% of stream miles above the 2008 baseline for the Chesapeake Bay watershed," suggests there will be no degradation of stream health. How are you considering this?
  - The Workgroup has thought about this, and will address it in the development of management strategies. Perhaps the two GITs can coordinate in these efforts.
- A brook trout prioritization tool is being developed, targeting streams that are important for brook trout restoration and protection. The North Atlantic Landscape Conservation Cooperative will be helping to develop a tool for the Chesapeake Bay.
- Suggestion: As done for brook trout, it may also be useful to overlay the black duck catchments on the map of state-identified healthy watersheds.
  Action item: follow-up with these ideas for management strategy development as well as consideration by the Tracking workgroup.
- Question: Are the black duck lands primarily tidal?
  - No, but tidal lands are where black duck food is primarily found.
  Action item: Share the STAC Workshop Report, "Designing Sustainable Coastal Habitats," with Healthy Watershed Goal Team members.

Maintaining Healthy Watersheds in Clarke County, Virginia
Alison Teetor, Natural Resource Planner, presented on Clarke County's demographics, planning and zoning policies, land conservation, and water quality improvement efforts. Starting in 1980, the county set goals to preserve agriculture and open space and concentrate growth. The county implemented a number of supporting actions to achieve those goals – e.g. sliding scale zoning, 3 acre maximum lot size, land use tax, and conservation easement authority.

For a link to her presentation and more information:
- http://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/21726/ches_bay_talk_6-6-14.pdf

Other discussion points and questions:
- 98% of the county is rural, with a lot of agriculture, cattle, and large farms. There are 26 perennial streams total – some flow to the Opequon Creek and others to the Shenandoah River. The area is also dominated by karst and limestone geology. For this reason there are numerous sinkholes and springs.
- In 1980, sliding scale zoning was adopted. This was possible because of the county's homogeneous community and pride in a long, multigenerational history of farming. Outreach to locals helped this zoning practice get adopted. The community felt strongly about protecting agriculture and open space.
- 22% of the county is protected through easements.
- Staff spend most of their time and efforts on impaired waters. The county does not focus on "not impaired" waters because of lack of money and staff.
- Stakeholders have been key in the county's efforts.
- Allison showed a video on C-Spout Run: Restoring a Shenandoah Valley Spring Creek. This video is embedded in her PowerPoint presentation.
- Question: How do you think the health of the streams have changed in the county over time and how would you project where things would go?
  - The hope would be to maintain current levels, if not improve conditions. Education and environmental literacy is more prevalent today than in the past, and Best Management Practices (BMP) sciences have come a long way.
- The geology of the area has a large impact on how nitrogen enters the environment (e.g. through sinkholes). Pasture management, rotational grazing, manure management help address that.

Management Strategies and Funding Opportunity
<u>Management Strategies:</u> With the signing of the Bay Agreement, the GIT's two new workgroups, and the need to develop management strategies in the next year, many of the conversations of this meeting can potentially feed into management strategy development. This portion of the agenda was devoted to a conversation surrounding management strategies.

Mark reminded members that we have already done quite a lot of work towards management strategies (e.g. 2013 management strategy document).
For a link to the 2013 GIT Management Strategy document:
- http://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/21726/git4_strategy_012213.pdf

Staff at the Chesapeake Bay Program have developed a management strategy matrix to help guide some of the work and cross-GIT collaboration. For a link to the draft Management Strategy matrix:
- http://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/21726/mgmt_strat_development_matrix_5-22-14_6314.pdf

Healthy Watersheds GIT leaders and select members agreed to address some of Chesapeake Bay Agreement Draft public comments during the development of management strategies in the next year. For a summary of those comments, please see slide 16 in the following PowerPoint presentation:

- http://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/21726/meeting_slides_-_maintain_healthy_watersheds_june_2014.pdf

Discussion - STAC Comments:
The GIT received a number of comments from STAC regarding the healthy watersheds goal and outcome in the agreement and management strategies. STAC's comments are summarized in slides 17 – 19 in the following PowerPoint presentation:

- http://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/21726/meeting_slides_-_maintain_healthy_watersheds_june_2014.pdf
- Gene Yagow (STAC representative) felt encouraged by the discussion. However, he expressed his concern over how the goal language does not acknowledge the addition of new watersheds. It has no change element, it is a status-quo goal. He added that if the Bay Program is successful in its restoration efforts, there will be a lot more healthy watersheds.
- The STAC comments will be taken into account during the drafting of management strategies in the next year. The Goal Team is committed to this.

Funding Opportunity:
In fiscal year 2014, EPA received an increase in Chesapeake Bay Program funds. While much of this increase was directed to state and local implementation of the TMDL, EPA has set aside some of the additional funding to support specific projects that the partnership's GITs identify as valuable to their work. In addition, EPA is encouraging cross-GIT projects that would support multiple objectives. Because of the need for EPA to obligate this funding quickly, GIT chairs are working with EPA to try and make this a collaborative funding pot. This session is an opportunity to discuss such opportunities and ideas for projects.

A list of ideas has been developed by the Healthy Watersheds GIT leaders and a handful of GIT members. These ideas include:

- Identification of additional healthy waters (for example, make use of the USGS NAWQA methodology to identify additional high quality waters, or reference sites, in the watershed).
- Leveraging local lessons (white paper summarizing local lessons learned from healthy waters protection.
- Updating the Resource Lands Assessment (update maps of resource lands and values, as well as areas threatened for conversion).
- Connecting Land Trusts and Chesapeake Water Quality (curriculum guide; service map).
- Demonstration project designed to test incentives for forestland retention through the TMDL model (pilot demonstration project in the Rappahannock River Basin to demonstrate positive forest retention actions).

For the remainder of the meeting, Mark requested additional feedback on the GIT's list of ideas:

Action item: distribute or make available project ideas to the goal team for input. The Habitat and Fisheries GITs' ideas will also be distributed.

- A member expressed support for the following idea: Demonstration project designed to test incentives for forestland retention through the TMDL Model (pilot demonstration project in the Rappahannock River Basin to demonstrate how positive forest retention actions).
- In regards to the idea of developing a white paper summarizing local lessons learned from healthy waters protection, a member shared that the Local Government Advisory Committee (LGAC) already has a list of recommendations on how information can disseminated and the kinds of tools to use to engage local governments on TMDL policies.
- Money will also need to be passed through to local governments to meet the needs of the TMDL.
- Funds could be used to help designate priority watersheds that are important for various outcomes in the Chesapeake Watershed Agreement.
- This is the start of the conversation. Doors and phones are wide open for GIT members as they think of new ideas.