



## Habitat Goal Implementation Team Fall Meeting

**Wednesday, November 8**

Chesapeake Bay Foundation's [Brock Environmental Center](#)

[3663 Marlin Bay Drive](#)

[Virginia Beach, VA 23455](#)

**Conference Line:** (515) 604-9300

**Conference Code:** 482477

**Adobe Connect:** <http://epawebconferencing.acms.com/habgit/>

(Note: Enter as Guest with your name and affiliation)

**Theme:** Ramping up progress through coordinated use of science tools, leveraging of funds in priority places, and communication with local decision-makers.

### Meeting Objectives:

1. Clarify Workgroup priorities and challenges through logic framework-based work planning.
2. Facilitate inclusion of habitat-based BMPs in State and local efforts to reduce nutrient and sediment loads.

**10:00 am**      **Welcome & Introductions** – Christine Conn (MD DNR) and David Whitehurst (VA DGIF), HGIT Co-Chairs

**10:15 am**      **Making Progress and Adapting our Work – Workgroup Chairs** (10 minutes each)  
Brook Trout, Stream Health, Fish Passage, Fish Habitat, and SAV workgroups will report on 2016-17 progress and outline anticipated changes to workplans for 2018-19

### Workplan Timeline Update – Gina

- Workplans due in March
- Guidance from MB for interim time for stakeholder involvement / participation

### Brook Trout – Steve Faulkner

- 8% increase in occupied habitat
- Focusing on identifying priority areas, stressors and impacts on restoration priorities
- Progress: 9 of 13 action items completed – examples:
  - o Working on supporting restoration efforts
  - o Updating Chesapeake Bay Brook Trout occupancy model
  - o Risk assessment / unconventional Gas analysis
  - o Groundwater analysis + impacts of brown trout on habitat usage
- Gaps:
  - o Important to quantify progress toward outcomes – putting projects on the ground and monitoring
  - o Difficult to determine progress, conservation/restoration projects are not comprehensively tracked and compiled
  - o Traditional methods are costly / inaccurate – explore new methods
  - o Managers / practitioners aren't aware of how important genetic info can be to inform decisions
    - Want to have workshop to help managers explore methods and applications
  - o Multiple decision support tools and models – hard to decide which to use in specific situations
  - o Hard to get info into the hands of decision makers
  - o Invested team members – full chain of command
    - Area where members can submit agency data and projects

- Points of contact for resources and support
  - Additional points of funding
- Actions:
  - State and NGO reps to work on progress reporting
  - Work on eDNA
    - Currently working on white paper of eDNA applications
  - Workshop highlighting DSTs and models
  - Develop outreach and communications strategy
    - Mike Slattery – Upper Gunpowder group getting involved w/ communications strategy via CBF and CBPO Communications team
    - Scott Scapone – working closely with BTAT
  - Partners submit 2-4 agency mandated action items to involve partners
- Comments:
  - Co-benefits BMPs?
    - Full stream shading from buffers not going to help achieve outcome by 2020 – important to protect areas where groundwater is effectively cooling stream temps

#### Stream Health – Matt Meyers

- Gaps:
  - Keeping members engaged
    - Meeting in December
    - Gaging interest and membership
  - Incorporating pooled monitoring and functional assessments across agencies and jurisdictions for monitoring and design
- Actions:
  - 2008 Baseline development
    - Funding secured + workshop being planned
    - Cross collaborations from baseline development
      - Coordinate with Fish Habitat goal – connect in the future as more details come to light
      - Fish habitat STAC workshop in late February
    - \*Keep dialog open between fish habitat and stream health via Gina Hunt\*
- Permitting
  - Aiming to streamline permitting processes across watershed
  - Josh Burch heading panel
  - Members being compiled from jurisdictions
    - Still need rep from DE
  - Send needed jurisdictional reps to Management Board
  - Alicia Logalbo (USACE) – willing to send request to Regulatory group
- 

#### Fish Passage – Mary Andrews (42:00)

- No targets removed or added
  - Focusing on dam and culvert removals
  - Fish Passage Prioritization Tool Updated – not for brook trout, focusing on anadromous
    - Transitioned to new IT platform (java)
- 2016 Target achieved
  - Changed calculating methods to include full tributaries
  - New method officially adopted by CBP this year
    - Discussions of increasing goals, but would require amendment of 2014 Watershed Agreement language– not recommended, but clarification of process would be helpful
    - Group will continue to work towards increasing mileage despite reaching goal
- 2018-2020:

- No major changes anticipated
- Focus on road crossings / culvert removal
- Gaps:
  - Private landowners not willing/ interested in removing privately owned dams
  - Educating about dam removal ancillary benefits – flood reduction, public safety (aimed at policy makers, land owners)
  - Funding
- Actions:
  - Land owner willingness: encourage jurisdictions to model groups after PA
    - MD working with PA to function more collaboratively
  - Ancillary Benefits: target local and county governments to educate on enlarging culverts / adding bridges to avoid flooding
  - Funding: ensure bay program funds continue to include passage projects as a priority
- Comments:
  - Jennifer – Encourage BMP inclusion in new Work Plan
    - Is culvert replacement recognized as a BMP in model?
      - Not a BMP b/c not directly addressing sediment or nutrients
      - Can play a role in future mitigation funds – want to develop something similar to dam removal program
      - Tie culverts to stream restoration – added benefits for living resources
        - Denise Clearwater – that goal is getting lost with crediting etc.
    - Look at cross benefits BMP related to BMP and flooding – connect w/ LGAC
      - LGAC – December 14/15 (legacy sediments, culverts)
        - Talking about culverts and mill dams
          - Interested in other actions that could take place in conjunction with culvert removal that local jurisdictions would be interested in
        - **HGIT want to touch base with Mary Gattis prior to LGAC meeting**
  - Mike Slattery – eel passage at Washington aqueduct
    - Opportunity to seek support from Baltimore district
    - Interested in developing relationship between USACE and state / local governments
    - Mary Andrews: not highly involved in these projects – currently not focused on ladders / structures. Workgroup does not object to these projects.
  - David Whitehurst – connections of BMP for habitats and BMPs getting credits in model and communication to local jurisdictions?
    - Jennifer – connections are increasing in prevalence. Water Quality GIT funded Tetrattech report to highlight “co-benefits”. Cross-GIT groups talking about best format to distribute findings to local jurisdictions.
    - Encouraging BMP inclusion in new Workplans

#### Fish Habitat – Gina Hunt (1:07)

- Minor, ongoing efforts removed from workplan
- Added:
  - New financing language
    - Potential for future CBP Financial Workshop
  - Communications products for incorporation into WIPs
    - Highlight stressors from hardened shorelines and impervious
    - Land owners, local government
  - Citizen monitoring
    - Some existing projects, would like to explore partnerships
  - **Want to coordinate with Brook Trout and Stream Health in the future**
- STAC Workshop in February 2018
  - Analyze and communicate stressors
  - Help to identify data gaps

- Building blocks for regional Tidal and non-tidal assessments
- Asks:
  - Incorporate fish habitat into WIPs – see agenda item at 1:30pm
    - Ongoing effort
- Gaps:
  - Communicate beyond the WIP in local governments
    - More agency coordination and public participation
    - Understanding shoreline stabilization / living shorelines
      - Data deficient to compare longevity and effectiveness
- Actions:
  - Partners to connect with targeted audiences
    - LGAC w/ local government
    - Jurisdictions w/ practitioners (planners, permitting, restoration professionals)
  - Partnering with other outcomes
    - Stream Health, Brook Trout
- Comments:
  - Neely Law – Information gap of which stream restoration features provide best habitats
    - Potential white paper for restoration guidance for effective habitat construction for species by species
    - Good overlap between Stream Health and Fish Habitat
    - **\*Request for copy of proceedings to share with Gina**
  - Steve Faulkner : potential collaboration with other research on living shorelines

#### SAV – Paige Hobaugh (1:22)

- Items removed:
  - Some have been completed or will be completed by the time new workplans are due
  - Language changed to reflect items not directly influenced by workgroup (i.e. water quality)
- Items Added:
  - Budget and Financing strategy: working with Budget and Financing workgroup for long term financial support
    - Discussing with stakeholders
    - This is a pilot program
  - SAV Citizen Science monitoring program
    - GIT funding
  - Reviewing SAV Regulations
    - GIT funding
- Requests:
  - Success of SAV has resulted in harvesting
    - Want to create outreach campaign to promote positive attitudes
  - Creating pilot program to help fund aerial study
- Gaps:
  - Time and human effort to sustain financing strategy
  - Short term funding
  - Water quality and habitat – not under outcome
    - Depend on other workgroups
- Actions:
  - Discuss short term financing options
  - Support effort of communications of BMPs
    - Help promote water quality goals
- Comments:
  - Alicia Logalbo: spatial data on recovery projects?
    - **Follow up from Paige**

11:15 am

**Ensuring Participation** – Greg Barranco (EPA, Government Affairs, Partnership Team Lead)

Greg will lead a discussion on organizational challenges being experienced partnership-wide and what steps we can take to overcome them (1:33)

- CBPO wide challenges with participation and engagement
  - o Small number of people participating in multiple groups
  - o Hard to get people to step into leadership
- Trying to create streamline and efficiency
- Previously brainstormed solutions to discuss:
  - o Consolidate workgroups / prioritize outcomes
  - o Eliminating some outcomes
- Comments:
  - o Gina Hunt: workgroup participants are very specialized. Consolidating will dilute the focus of the groups and potentially lose people / expertise
  - o Christine Conn: Analyze “human capital”? Who is working on multiple workgroups – does it happen as much as it seems?
    - Greg: No formal analysis. Potentially worth looking into.
  - o Greg: Participation in general is down. Ideas –
    - Get partners to agree to workgroup participation included in job descriptions
    - Steve Faulkner : need chair of workgroup to have a direct link to higher level management in states / jurisdictions
      - Get outcomes to align with state goals
      - If they are directly related, state managers will incorporate CBP time into individual job duties of members
    - Matt Meyers: historically struggle to get individual teams to keep moving forward
      - Focus of December meeting to streamline
    - David Whitehurst:
      - Putting more emphasis on other goals (i.e. not water quality) will help invigorate
      - Take the requirements to the Principal staff committee to get more consistency
    - Jennifer Greiner:
      - Consolidation of groups vs. increase communication between existing groups
      - For HGIT: tidal vs. non-tidal is a nice split
        - o Potential themed meetings – help to invigorate meetings by relevant content for all attendants
        - o More focused meetings will eliminate some obligations for a subset
    - Margot Cumming: hard to get any responses from members – they think they’re not important
      - Greg: Chair reaching out has been successful for generating involvement in the past (toxics workgroup)
    - Mike Slattery: going beyond jurisdictions to operate on a landscape scale conservation frame
      - How can the work already being done on large scale habitat connectivity inform the Bay programs goals? May be able to draw tighter connections between groups by working on different scales.
    - David Whitehurst: various groups that extend beyond the bay watersheds might be a good way to provide expertise without convening on two separate groups
      - Atlantic coast joint ventures + others
    - Christine Conn: reduce redundancy by leveraging regional groups
  - o Greg: with these regional partnerships, can the review structure still be achieved?

- Gina Hunt: with high functioning quantitative outcomes, yes. If smaller, qualitative then it might be harder to satisfy the requirements / harder to show progress
  - Jennifer Greiner: Human capital is still over tapped – where missions align, it is justifiable. But when goals diverge, questions of why arise.
- Wrap Up:
  - Don't try to co-opt groups beyond their focus. Most groups won't get more engaged because they are busy with their own goals.
  - Important to identify CBP goals in work descriptions and for agency supervisors
    - Align jurisdictional goals more formally with CBP to ensure engagement
  - Increase support from above, increase communication and coordination
  - Targeted communications – seeing only what they're interested in
  - Align meetings for efficiency

**12:00 pm      Lunch (2:12)**

**1:00 pm      What's a WIP? – Lucinda Power (EPA, Water Quality GIT Coordinator) (3:09)**

- WIP: strategies and commitments, numeric and programmatic that jurisdictions have in place to meet their Nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment TMDLs under the Bay Agreement by 2025
- WIP Process –
  - 2010 settlement agreement between EPA and Chesapeake Bay Foundation
    - Produced TMDL regulations
    - Informed by jurisdictional phase 1 WIPs – how loads are divided in the jurisdictional areas, as well as programs to be put into place
  - 2014 resigning of the Bay Agreement was a recommitment to the 2017 and 2025 milestone goals
    - Recommitted to TMDL outcomes – long term water quality
  - Accountability framework stems from WIP – how jurisdictions are going to meet allocations by 2025
    - 2 year milestones – ensure documents stay relevant and meet midpoint goals
    - BMP implementation strategy
    - Policies in place to achieve water quality goals
  - Federal Actions: resources to assist state if not meeting targets
    - Targeted funding
    - Programmatic assessments of infrastructure
- Phase 3 Goals – achieve water quality standards
  - Taking into account other outcomes
  - Demonstrate by 2025 that standards will be met
- State driven documents
  - Phase 1 and 2:
    - 2017 and 2025 Included load allocations and sources (point and non-point)
    - Current regulatory programs, technical resources
      - Gap analysis to assess capacity to reach goals
    - Account for future growth and increases in loads
    - BMP implementation strategies and tracking
      - Account for alternative methods if original plans aren't effective
- Status document –
  - EPA monitoring progress with programmatic milestone submissions annually
  - Tacking 2017 and 2025 goals
  - Method to keep track of
    - Monitoring and trends
    - Implementation of practices
    - Adaptive management of BMPs
    - \*available online\*
  - 2018-2019 milestone submitted in January 2018
- What's different in the Phase 3 WIPs –

- Numeric implementation values
- Engaging local partners – development and implementation over time
  - States responsible for finding partners
- Account for changes -
  - Climate change, dams, growth
  - Loads beyond original allocations that need to be accounted for
- Implement local planning goals
  - Measureable - numeric or programmatic
  - Below states major basin scale
  - Aimed at engaging local partners – understand what they need to do and what resources available
- Updated phase 6 model and CAST
  - Allows hypothetical situations to be run by many groups
  - Help to understand monitoring data
- Co-benefits of BMPs
  - Help partners to consider improvements that can help other outcomes, not just water quality
- Schedule:
  - Addressing Growth and changes – PSC making decisions at December Retreat
  - Planning Targets – December 2017
  - Expectation document released in January
  - Finalized in May – after jurisdictional review
  - Final WIP Documents – June 2019
- Comments:
  - Greg – how do expectations differ?
    - Not as specific in Phase 3 – jurisdictions understand the goals better
    - Emphasizing local engagement process
    - Accounting for change conditions
  - Greg: Federal Actions?
    - Available throughout this process
    - Often not tapped into – viewed as negative “consequences”
  - Denise Clearwater: Consideration of Co-Benefits
    - WIP Small group considering co-benefits
    - Occurring as jurisdictions developing WIP after new planning targets are released
      - 2018 / early 2019
  - Jennifer Greiner: Who is developing optimization system? / how can GITs weigh in on this?
    - Optimization system probably not functioning until 2019 – 2020 cycle
  - Mike Slattery: Can we include benefits that are not linked to water quality?
    - Yes – WIP small group working on which co-benefits we want to focus on

**1:20 pm**

**Local Government Perspective – Andria McClellan (Norfolk City Council)**

Andria will discuss Norfolk, VA BMP implementation and how they incorporate habitat into those efforts **(3:37)**

- Norfolk water management and flood risk actions:
  - Green Infrastructure Plan:
    - Aiming to address flooding resiliency, water quality and neighborhood quality
    - Separated into land and water themes
      - Access to open space and waterways throughout plan
      - Increase tree canopy
      - Increasing infiltration – older stormwater system cannot handle increase in precipitation
        - Focusing on high impervious, high topographic elevation (areas with highest run off)

- Asset mapping – community based input
- Shoreline restoration goals
  - 650 acres – 21% on Chesapeake bay buffer area
- Overall, local officials don't talk a lot about water quality
  - Focusing on protecting what is important to the community – i.e infrastructure, assets etc.
  - Expert input is helpful to educate officials and influence policies
- Discussion
  - Co-benefits? Very helpful to prioritize funding
  - Find a champion in the local government to always be talking about the issues

**1:30 pm**

**Encouraging “Co-Benefit” BMPs – Gina Hunt (MD DNR, Fish Habitat Action Team Chair)**

Gina will provide examples of how CBP is working actively to develop communication tools and messaging to facilitate inclusion of habitat-based BMPs in Phase III WIPs **(3:51)**

- Co-benefits in phase III WIPS
  - Small group formed after requests to Management Board
    - Led by Niki Kasi
  - Survey of partners and jurisdictions to gauge interest
    - Targeted outcomes to include in WIPs
    - Kinds of outreach/ communication materials and tools for each
    - Outcomes with 4+ responses will be targeted for WIP inclusion
      - Fish Habitat, Brook Trout, SAV, Forest Buffers, Tree Canopy, Healthy Watersheds, Protected Lands, toxics, climate resiliency, public access, wetlands, stream health
  - Tools:
    - Many ideas that are not feasible at this point of time
    - Factsheets - currently working on
    - Co-benefits table – currently working on
      - Based on TetraTech table
      - BMP compendium in development
- Next Steps:
  - Discuss weighted table of Co-benefits table when released from WIP small group
  - Co-benefits language for WIP
    - Jurisdictions want living document
  - Fact sheets for selected outcomes
- Discussion:
  - Denise Clearwater: TetraTech study was very site and design specific for habitat benefits. Important to provide additional details for measurable BMP crediting to ensure improvements are seen and unintended consequences are avoided.
    - Jurisdictional contacts included on Fact Sheets

**1:45 pm**

**Hearing from our Partners: Funders and Facilitators of Habitat Work in the Watershed (20 mins each)**

- **NFWF Business Plan Update – Jake Reilly (National Fish & Wildlife Foundation) (4:08)**
  - 2012 first business plan
    - Outcomes, goals, and strategies for implementation in the Chesapeake
  - Update to reflect changes in 2014 watershed agreement, data, decision support tools
    - Aiming to better align NFWF goals with CBP
  - Items to Update:
    - Clear conservation needs related areas of interest
    - Associated conservation outcomes
      - Habitat sites, water quality goals, geographic focus
      - Supporting projects that are related to co-benefits
    - Implementation plan
      - Specific actions to fund



- 10 – 15 million in competitive grant funding
  - Monitoring and evaluation to measure success
    - Self-funding, broader/partner based monitoring
  - Operational budget
- Recent Activities:
  - Summer 2017 ramped up engagement in plan revamp
    - Outreach through CBPO to engage GITs re: key questions
  - Fall 2017 – decisions and outlining
    - Decided on HUC 12 units for geographic focus
    - Finalize water quality focus areas
      - Using most recent WQGIT data – TMDL implementation, load reduction goals
      - Data related to local water quality: USGS sediment data
      - Layer with habitat and wildlife priorities to see areas with multiple benefits\*\*
    - Want to structure goal around BT
      - Protect current habitat
      - Work on projects to promote connectivity and habitat improvement
    - River herring outcome – focus on stream miles opened
      - Tap into connectivity work being done by partners
      - Working with SERC for updated habitat use modeling
        - \*discuss fish passage prioritization tool with fish passage workgroup/TNC/SERC to refine geographic priorities and implementation strategies
      - Using fish passage metric to track
    - Considering adding BD outcome
      - Working with Atlantic Coast Joint Venture to evaluate tradeoffs of water quality and BD population gains
      - Focusing on wintering areas
    - Resilience – incorporating into outcomes and focal areas after establishment
  - Next Steps:
    - Work with GITs to identify how NFWF can fit with CBPO
      - Brook trout and Black Duck
    - August 2018 approval of business plan
      - Drafts due May 2018
    - Involvement in SRS – helping future processes
    - Continued ongoing engagement at GIT level
- Discussion:
  - Steve Faulkner : important to align goals with partners, b/c some partners will be less likely to be engaged if goals are too broad
    - Jake: Aligning goals is a major focus for future projects

- **USACE Comprehensive Plan Update – Alicia Logalbo (USACE, Norfolk District) (4:31)**

- Plan developed jointly by Norfolk and Baltimore districts of USACE and NFWF
- Single integrated restoration plan to assist with implementation of the Chesapeake Bay Agreement
- Identifying actions to be taken in the watershed
  - ACE missions
  - Outside groups

- Aiming to have series of recommendations for enhancements, restoration, protection, and preservation
    - Full watershed level
    - Specific jurisdictions recommendations
    - Sub-watershed analysis – identified by states as initial priorities
  - Targeted geospatial investigations to identify specific focal areas for restoration actions
    - Based on HUC 10
    - Habitat, wetland, connectivity, conservation...
  - Example – wetland prioritization
    - Intersecting with various other screens – avian, dredging, threats,
      - Co-benefits
  - Stakeholder opinions:
    - Identify areas of priority in each jurisdictions
    - Hotspot map produced – overlapped with co-benefits
    - States ranked based on priority maps and overlapping benefit layers, costs
  - Overall goals:
    - Geospatially prioritized areas for most benefits
    - Stakeholder coordination
    - Funding
  - Final report due Summer 2018
  - HGIT Comments:
    - **Include State Wildlife Action Plans (SWAPs) in analysis to equalize state rankings**
- **USGS Science Plan Update – Ken Hyer (USGS) (4:50)**
    - “Evolution” happening b/c
      - Major projects wrapping up 2018 – midpoint assessment WQ, endocrine disruption, land change...
      - Administration changes / reduced federal resources
      - Federal responsibilities
      - Unmet partner needs within the Bay Agreement
      - Funding outlook
    - Goal: define relative priorities and align USGS directions and needs of Watershed agreement
    - Timeline: 2018 planning, 2019 implementation
    - New Science Themes:
      - DOI Priorities
        - Energy, infrastructure, lands, public trust responsibilities
      - USGS
        - Natural resources (energy)
        - Land and water management
        - Public safety, healthy and property
      - Bay Agreement
        - USGS fitting into bay outcomes and goals:
          - Restoration response – how are systems changing in response
          - Prioritize largest unmet science needs
          - Fish, habitat, water quality, toxics, watersheds, land conservation
    - Potential refined themes:
      - Fisheries and habitat
      - Migratory water birds
      - People and lands
      - Integrate and inform – synthesis goal
        - Includes co-benefits

- Example for Fisheries
  - Science to support recreational fisheries, aquatic conditions, fish health (“3 sub-tasks”)
  - “headwater to tidewater”
    - Characterize fish, fish habitat, and fish health in each area of interest (3 tasks)
    - Multiple recreational species, invasive sp., endangered sp. Etc.
- Integrated studies were a major focus of the development of new themes
  - Multiple species, multiple habitats
  - Keep all the pieces as connected as possible
  - **\*\*Taking into account stressors, drivers and how they interact to explain what is going on in the system\*\***
    - Aquatic and biotic stressors
    - Benthic conditions
    - Disease pathogen / parasite / invasives
- Aquatic Conditions Theme:
  - Shift from water quality
  - Two subthemes:
    - Water quality / water chemistry / flow – align w/ recreational fishery
    - Link with tidal system conditions
  - Aiming to align fish health work with recreational fisheries throughout the watershed
    - Fish consumption
  - BMP activities driven by nutrient and sediments –
    - Co-benefits for toxics
- Migratory waterbirds:
  - Current work focuses on Black Duck as indicator
  - Bioenergetics model being developed for food and habitat requirements
    - Finishing 2018
  - Evolve to take into account multiple species, multiple coastal habitats
    - Account for wetland adaptation to sea level rise, sediment load shifts
    - Potentially use different species for different areas
      - BD – coastal, diving / sea ducks
      - \_\_\_\_\_ - deeper, open water
      - Lesser skulk – shallow systems
      - Add fresh water? Tidal? – wood duck?
- 2018:
  - Completing, synthesizing current projects that are finishing
  - Continue ongoing work – BD, wetlands
  - Evolving science activities
    - Identifying unmet science / management needs
    - Develop new science questions
      - Based on USGS capabilities and needs throughout the bay
  - 2019 implementation of new science plan

**2:45 pm            Break**

**3:00 pm            Virginia Examples – Matt Meyers (Fairfax Co., VA), Becky Gwynn (VA DGIF)**

Partners in Virginia will share examples of habitat restoration/conservation work that might benefit from and/or inform landscape-scale science tools

Southern Tip Ecological Partnership – Becky Gwynn **(5:12)**

- Southern tip of Delmarva Peninsula – VA portion of eastern shore

- High priority habitat for various avian migrants
  - o 1990s study of coastal corridor to assess value and need for peninsula
- Partnership Goals: acquisition and restoration of migratory birds and maintenance of intact coastal habitats
  - o Numerous formal partners – federal, state, NGO,
- Priorities:
  - o 10km zone from tip bordering bayside and seaside coastlines in 1.5 km strip
    - Expanded to include entirety of both southernmost counties due to additional data of bird habitat use
  - o Forest restoration
    - Plantings for food and shelter
    - Based on bioenergetics studies – not enough food available currently
- Collaborations:
  - o Updated inventory of land holdings – currently 30,000 acres
  - o Sharing of management plans
  - o Expert input for future habitats needs
    - Communicate with communities in the area
  - o Prioritize land acquisitions
- Activities on the ground:
  - o Habitat management
    - On and off land – promoting native plants throughout the peninsula,
  - o Invasive species control
  - o Education and outreach
  - o “Coastal Gems” – GIS tool for prioritization + co-benefits
- Reevaluate schemes to include importance of VA Eastern Shore on a regional level
  - o Update regional datasets with decision support tools that have been developed to highlight needs and gaps of STP
  - o Acquisition prioritization
- **Potential future collaboration efforts with CBP**

#### Fairfax County – Matt Meyers

- Watershed Restoration and Protection
  - o Watershed Management Plan (WMP) developed for each of the 30 watersheds
  - o Identify and address issues affecting water quality + other benefits
    - Biological monitoring, stream physical assessment, watershed assessment
  - o 600 miles of degraded streams / DEQ list 105 impaired waters
- 5 year implementation plan
  - o Based on WMP
  - o Other projects happening in the region
- Seeking partnerships throughout the county
  - o Parks, private public partnerships,
- Aiming to move beyond TMDLs
  - o Benthic impairments
  - o Functional lift
  - o Riparian corridors
  - o Vegetation assessments / invasive managements / landscape design specs
- Increasing preservation ordinances

**3:30 pm Nature’s Network Preview** – Jennifer Greiner (USFWS) and Paige Hobaugh (HGIT Staffer)  
 Jennifer and Paige will provide an overview of tomorrow’s training workshop objectives

- Training starting tomorrow at 8am

**3:45 pm**      **Action Item Review and ideas for Spring Meeting – Jennifer Greiner (USFWS, HGIT Coordinator) and Margot Cumming (HGIT Staffer)**

Discussions of future meetings:

- Split into tidal / non – tidal
  - o Undecided
- Potentially have meeting on Blackwater NWR

Action Items:

- o Stream permitting panel member from DE
- o Gina: follow up with Mid Atlantic Stream Restoration Conference (study on species specific habitat construction)
- o Paige: SAV spatial data to Alecia Logalbo
- o Lucinda: Provide Clarifying WIP language (attached)
- o Workgroup Chairs: Inform Greg re: progress on GIT participation
- o Jennifer: Discuss w/ LGAC re: culverts and dam removal prior to December 14/15 meeting
- o Mary: FH coordinate with BT and SH
- o Jen/Christine/David: Work with NFWF re: brook trout / black duck outcomes
- o Mary: Fish Passage WG discuss fish passage prioritization tool with NFWF/TNC/SERC
- o Cross outcome coordination - CBP Calendar on Chesapeake.net
- o Guidance on fish species and fish habitat design – assigning co-benefits

**4:15pm**      **Adjourn**