

Actions from November 18, 2021 Aquatic Life Quarterly Progress Meeting

Request	Agreed Partner action (responsible parties identified in bold red)	Due date
Submerged Aquatic Vegetation		
<p>“The SAV Workgroup asks that the Management Board advocate for further reduction of Nitrogen, Phosphorus, and Total Suspended Sediment loads to the Bay. Improving water clarity will be the most effective way to improve SAV resilience to climate stressors and the only means of maintaining viable eelgrass populations in the lower Bay.”</p> <p>Addendum 11/23: Specifically, we ask the MB to help ensure that funding from the Infrastructure Bill is directed to programs and projects that support BMPs shown to have significant effects on N, P, and TSS load reductions to the Bay (that benefit SAV growth), such as technology improvements to wastewater treatment plants and stormwater run-off systems. Additional funding should be allocated to more site-specific projects that improve water quality and land-shore connections like riparian buffers and living shorelines. Finally, to support efforts to directly restore SAV where needed as water quality improves, infrastructure funding should be allocated to the construction and management of a large-scale SAV nursery to ensure that seeds are available when conditions are conducive to success.</p>	<p>ACTION 1: Management Board recognizes that achieving our water clarity goals via reductions in nitrogen, phosphorus, and total suspended sediment loads identified in our TMDLs is the most effective action toward realizing our SAV goals. As a result, the Management Board commits to taking benefits to SAV into consideration when applying funds (including the new federal Infrastructure Funding) to BMP implementation and welcomes input from the SAV Workgroup in identifying BMP types and locations (ex. co-location with SAV beds, oyster/mussel projects) that may be particularly co-beneficial to SAV restoration.</p> <p>ACTION 2: SAV Workgroup will include actions in their next 2-year Logic and Action Plan (LAP) to collaborate with STAR, the Fisheries GIT, and others as appropriate to improve our understanding of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-location of land-based BMPs, oyster/mussel restoration, and SAV • Local effect of flow/Stormwater run-off on SAV density and acreages and options for targeting BMPs that would protect priority SAV areas. <p>ACTION 3: Maryland will explore options for creating a legal framework for participation in blue carbon markets similar to Virginia’s example.</p>	<p>ACTION 1: On-going</p> <p>ACTION 2: Feb. 3, 2022</p> <p>ACTION 3: N/A</p>
Oysters		

Request	Agreed Partner action (responsible parties identified in bold red)	Due date
<p>“Reaffirm commitment from states, other partners, to ensure we complete planned work”</p> <p>“Amplify success to date”</p> <p>“Support for DEIJ efforts”</p>	<p><u>ACTION 4:</u> The Oyster Workgroup will include actions in their next 2-year LAP to collaborate with the Education, Stewardship, and Communications Workgroups on approaches to amplify/broadcast their success in achieving the outcome goals, including their benefits to the public and commercial fisheries and broader ecosystem services.</p> <p><u>ACTION 5:</u> The Oyster Workgroup will work with the Diversity Workgroup to evaluate lessons learned on the restoration projects on the Lafayette River and Eastern Branch of the Elizabeth River for applications to other projects over their next 2-year LAP.</p>	<p><u>ACTION 4:</u> Feb. 3, 2022</p> <p><u>ACTION 5:</u> Feb. 3, 2022</p>
Blue Crabs		
<p>“Support science and research needs for blue crab population assessment and management needs identified in SSRF.”</p>	<p><u>ACTION 6:</u> CBSAC and STAR will review current blue crab population assessment and management research needs identified in SSRF and update as appropriate.</p> <p><u>ACTION 7:</u> Based on the Action 6 review, CBSAC will report back to MB on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) their <u>highest priority</u> blue crab research, assessment, and workshop needs and timelines in order to achieve the Blue Crab Outcome. Included in this evaluation should be CBSAC’s recommendation on the value of conducting a new blue crab benchmark stock assessment, and b) estimated costs and recommended jurisdictional contributions for each of the above including a new blue crab benchmark stock assessment (if recommended). 	<p><u>ACTION 6:</u> Discuss at Dec. 2 2021 CBSAC meeting. Report out at Dec. 9, 2021 MB Meeting.</p> <p><u>ACTION 7:</u> Feb. 24, 2022 for discussion at Mar. 10, 2022 MB Meeting.</p>

Request	Agreed Partner action (responsible parties identified in bold red)	Due date
“Provide endorsement for research funding opportunities (e.g., GIT funding) that can address blue crab science needs”	ACTION 8: Management Board agrees to write letters of support as appropriate to realize funding for identified blue crab population research and assessment needs.	ACTION 8: On-going
Forage Fish		
“Connect information on forage status and trends to habitat conservation, land use, and other policy decisions (e.g., incorporate findings into CBC meetings)”	ACTION 9: Forage Action Team will contact the Chesapeake Bay Commission to schedule a presentation to CBC on recommended forage related topics when appropriate for both groups.	ACTION 9: N/A
“Emphasize the need for shallow-water fish surveys and plankton monitoring to explore possible correlations between living resource data with water quality parameters”	ACTION 10: ACTION: The Forage Action team will coordinate with Peter Tango and Lee McDonnell to ensure that forage needs are adequately considered in the ongoing monitoring needs assessment in advance of their presentation to the PSC in February.	ACTION 10: Late Winter

Other Items:

Outcome Attainability

- The Action Team gave an overview of their draft numeric and narrative dashboard. The MB recommended the content to the PSC (Nov. meeting) and they approved it as the basis of the report to the Executive Council.

DEIJ Strategy Implementation Plan and Management/Accountability Framework

- The DEIJ Action Team gave an overview of the final DEIJ Implementation Plan and the comments we received on it. The MB recommended the final plan and framework to the PSC (Nov. meeting) and accepted it in advance of the Dec. 15 EC meeting.