GIT FUNDING TABLE 1

TABLE 1: Please fill out with CRWG project ideas and send to mmerritt@chesapeakebay.net or cwu@chesapeakebay.net before the May 14 ace to Face meeting.

Your Name:	Jim George/Andrew May
Goal Implementation Team:	Scientific, Technical Assessment, and Reporting; Climate Resiliency Work Group
Project Title:	Landowner Attitudes on Shoreline Erosion Control
Project Type (See Section IV above)**:**	Policy Research and Recommendations
Goal/Outcome:	Improved Understanding of Public, Local, and Stakeholder Shoreline Stabilization Decisions
Estimated Cost:	$75,000

Justification: Provide a brief description of the work and why it is needed. It is recommended that you draw upon one or more work plans.	There continues to be much debate between shoreline stabilization permit applicants and regulatory agencies over the use of living shorelines as a stabilization practice. This delays the permit review process and consumes limited institutional regulatory capacity. It also results in lower than desired adoption rates of living shoreline practices. In order to improve the process and environmental outcomes, a better understanding of landowner and stakeholder knowledge and perceptions of living shorelines is needed. This information will support development of technical and communications tools, regulatory program enhancements, and guidance. It will also support the development of outreach and training materials needed to aid practitioners (marine contractors) and landowners in their selection and implementation of sustainable wetland restoration and protection projects. A survey of landowner and stakeholder attitudes would be a valuable first step in improving tools and achieving more successful living shoreline projects to meet various Chesapeake Bay management goals Primary: This supports the ***Climate Adaptation Outcome*** of the Climate Resilience Goals of the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement. Specifically, this project addresses the following Climate Adaptation Outcome Work Plan Key Action themes. Work plan barriers addressed by the project include linking science to implementation, providing guidance, more efficient use of limited institutional/regulatory capacity, stakeholder engagement: • Facilitate climate adaptation planning and project implementation guidance. • Explore mechanisms to encourage integration of climate considerations in the design and implementation of on-the-ground practices (living shorelines versus bulkheads and hardened shorelines) • Undertake Public, Stakeholder and Local Engagement (from Climate Resiliency Outcome Management Strategy) • Identify and address institutional barriers (Help justify adoption of more efficient and effective regulatory processes thereby making better use of limited institutional/regulatory capacity) • Test and develop new communications tools that are audience specific (targeting landowner and marine contractor audiences) • Develop information products that can be used to inform community-led coastal resiliency planning processes. (Transferable project results will increase the knowledge of citizen stewards and local leaders to support local conservation actions)

GIT FUNDING TABLE 1

Methodology: Provide a 1-2 paragraph description of how the work is likely to be accomplished.	Retain professional survey and communications entity (consultant) to work with MDE and interested CRWG members to identify target audiences and develop questions for surveys and focus groups. Consultant will conduct surveys and focus groups with representative landowners, shoreline communities, environmental advocacy organizations and marine contractors. The content of surveys will strive elicit how land owners and marine contractors select shoreline stabilization practices; their information sources; how they view living shorelines; their understanding of State agency support in selecting suitable shoreline practices; their perceptions about the efficacy and desirability of living shorelines; barriers and incentives for overcoming barriers. The consultant will use the feedback to develop improved outreach and education to landowners and marine contractors on how to select appropriate shoreline stabilization practice and benefits of living shoreline projects. The consultant will offer recommendations for changing regulatory program implementation processes to improve efficiency and environmental outcomes.

GIT FUNDING TABLE 1

Cross-Goal Benefits: What other goals may be advanced through this work?	This project supports other Bay Watershed Agreement Goals and Outcomes: Sustainable Fisheries Goal: Protect, restore and enhance finfish, shellfish and other living resources, their habitats and ecological relationships to sustain all fisheries and provide for a balanced ecosystem in the watershed and Bay. • Fish Habitat Outcome: Near shore and intertidal habitat benefits from natural shorelines. Vital Habitats Goal: Restore, enhance and protect a network of land and water habitats to support fish and wildlife and to afford other public benefits, including water quality, recreational uses and scenic value across the watershed. • Wetland outcome of 85,000 acre increase; 150,000 acres protected; • Black Duck Outcome (Prefer coastal brackish marshes and bays with adjacent agricultural land source for wintering: Lewis J.C. et al., 1984). Water Quality Goal: Reduce pollutants to achieve the water quality necessary to support the aquatic living resources of the Bay and its tributaries and protect human health. • 2025 Watershed Implementation Outcome Stewardship Goal: Increase the number and the diversity of local citizen stewards and local governments that actively support and carry out the conservation and restoration activities that achieve healthy local streams, rivers and a vibrant Chesapeake Bay. • Citizen Stewardship Outcome - Increase the number and diversity of trained and mobilized citizen volunteers with the knowledge and skills needed to enhance the health of their local watersheds • Local Leadership Outcome - Continually increase the knowledge and capacity of local officials on issues related to water resources and in the implementation of economic and policy incentives that will support local conservation actions.
Are you willing to serve as GIT lead (see description of the role in Section VI above) If no, suggest other GIT lead (with contact information)	Yes