



**Management Board Meeting
July 13, 2017
Actions/Decisions**

Introductions

- Action: CBP staff agreed to distribute the DoD Chesapeake Bay Program Journal to the MB.

Requests and Recommendations from May 11 Quarterly Progress Review Meeting

- Decision: The MB agreed that the first three SRS outcome groups (May, August and November) may delay developing their new two-year workplans until the SRS small group team finalizes a new workplan template. Once the new workplan template is provided, the groups will have 90 days to complete their workplans (anticipated completion date of March 2018). For these groups only, workplans should reflect planned actions through until their SRS review in 2019.
- Actions: The MB agreed to the following actions related to the specific outcomes:

Outcome	Request and Agreed Partner action
Fish Habitat	<p>The outcome workgroup is seeking assistance from MB members in distributing communication materials and educating local officials about how land use decisions affect fish habitat and fish—for potential inclusion in their Phase III WIPs.</p> <p>Pennsylvania, Maryland and West Virginia agreed to continue the dialogue with the Fish Habitat workgroup about this work. Maryland also encouraged the workgroup to reach out to funding organizations with a request to build their messaging/decision points into their funding/RFP process. CBP is in the process of developing a BMP matrix that identifies co-benefits of existing BMPs. It could be modified with a focus on habitat conditions (tidal saltwater, near-shore, non-tidal, etc.) that could support outreach efforts and be a useful tool for the states. STAR should also be consulted to review the BMPs.</p>
Fish Passage	<p>The Fish Passage Workgroup is seeking assistance from the MB in creating incentive programs for dam removal (e.g. tax deductions). They also need assistance reaching out to state dam safety offices to get them to consider ecological harm/impacts due to dam failure in addition to public safety concerns.</p> <p>The MB recommended that the workgroup work with the Chesapeake Bay Commission to review incentive programs and develop recommendations for state legislative proposals to address this issue.</p>

Brook Trout	<p>The workgroup asked the MB for help: 1) in garnering better support and participation in the workgroup; 2) with communications and outreach with key decision-makers and planners; and 3) with support for cross-GIT collaboration on monitoring efforts.</p> <p>The MB: 1) recommended GIT 6 poll the outcomes workgroups to help determine what GIT/workgroup participation problems exist and to discuss the results at the next MB meeting; 2) recommended that we look at <i>all</i> the combined communication and outreach efforts to locals before making a plan; and 3) directed STAR to look at the current efforts for improving monitoring including: the new optimization study/tool, Tetra Tech’s anticipated report, and the corollary benefits and avoided costs.</p>
Protected Lands	<p>The workgroup asked the MB for direction in creating incentives to effectively credit land conservation in the updated TMDL and Bay models.</p> <p>The MB recommended incorporating Protected Lands into the Phase III WIP communication discussion. They also suggested that the Protected Lands workgroup review the suggestions made by Peter Claggett and elevate them to the MB at future meetings for discussion.</p>

The following summary reflects MB actions/decisions for the other outcomes that were part of the first SRS review group at the May MB meeting:

Healthy Watersheds	<p>The workgroup asked the MB for help with: 1) getting consistent partner participation and engagement in the goal team; 2) outreach and communications with local officials and citizens; 3) evaluating how existing monitoring efforts can be leveraged by the GIT to assess healthy watershed status; and 4) recognition of healthy watersheds in partner WIPs (including maps and identifying co-benefits) to engender a more holistic approach to conservation and land-use planning.</p> <p>The MB: 1) recommended GIT 6 poll all outcome workgroups to help determine what GIT/workgroup participation problems exist and to discuss the results at the next MB meeting; 2) recommended that we look at <i>all</i> the combined communication and outreach efforts to locals before making a plan; 3) directed STAR to look at the current efforts for improving monitoring including the new optimization study/tool, Tetra Tech’s anticipated report, and the corollary benefits and avoided costs; and 4) recommended incorporating Healthy Watersheds into the Phase III WIP communication discussion.</p>
Stream Health	<p>The workgroup asked the MB: 1) to recommend potential new co-chairs for active workgroup leadership (the workgroup chair position is now vacant) and to recommend including active workgroup participation as an element in staff performance plans; and 2) help secure \$18,000 in funding to establish the 2008</p>

	<p>baseline and document progress toward the outcome. (The baseline data has already been collected; funding would cover the costs of analyzing the data.)</p> <p>Because the funding request is time sensitive, the MB recommended at their June 15, 2017 meeting to recommend a set-aside of \$18,000 of dedicated GIT funding to establish a 2008 baseline and help to document progress towards their outcome. The workgroup was advised to provide a written funding proposal. As with Healthy Watersheds, the MB recommended GIT 6 poll all outcome workgroups to help determine what GIT/workgroup participation problems exist and to discuss the results at the next MB meeting</p>
--	--

CBP Outcomes and Phase III WIPs

- Action: Agreed to form a small action team to assess which outcomes should be included in a combined set of WIP communication materials for taking to local governments for consideration in the Phase III WIPs. Interested persons should contact Greg Barranco. Current volunteers include: Nicki Kasi, Zoe Johnson, Kristin Saunders, Jim Edward, James Davis-Martin, Greg Barranco.
- Action: Nicki Kasi agreed to summarize the discussion and write up a straw proposal for how the outcomes could be incorporated in a consistent manner.
- Note: Of the outcomes identified by the GITs in their poll, MB members agreed that toxics is managed outside the Bay TMDL and should not be included in the Phase III WIPs to avoid confusion. However, MB members agreed that it would be helpful to incorporate information about the effectiveness of BMPs for reducing toxics into planning and communications documents.
- Note: MB members requested that EPA explore the possibility of 1) identifying innovative approaches for incorporating non-water quality outcomes in the Innovative Nutrient and Sediment Reduction program, and 2) how those outcomes might also be addressed in the context of community-based conservation strategies to protect and restore the Bay and its tributaries in the Small Watershed Grants program.