

Management Board Comments on Factsheets

January 31, 2018

Overarching Comments

USACE

- 1) All factsheets should be edited. There are multiple instances of awkward sentence structure, poor word choice, and grammar. **Addressed through other comments and proofread for clarity**
- 2) All factsheets must be reviewed for consistency. Of all, Fish Habitat is the least consistent in terms of format. However, most factsheets have at least some small items that are not consistent between them. **Working with communications team to make sure fact sheets are consistent.**

Maryland

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft WIP Co-Benefit Factsheets. The following are comments submitted by joint review by the Maryland Department of the Environment and Maryland Department of Natural Resources. It is our understanding that the purpose of these factsheets is to provide standard messaging on the co-benefits provided by a subset of Chesapeake Bay Program Watershed Agreement Outcomes for potential inclusion in State Watershed Implementation Plans, but that each State is free to modify these to best suit their needs. As such, Maryland primarily focused its comments below on facts and messaging, not on formatting. Maryland may alter the formatting of these factsheets before inclusion in our WIPs.

Finally, we understand that some of the comments below do not offer specific changes. Please do not hesitate to follow-up with us if that would be helpful when making the final edits.

Comments applicable to all fact sheets:

Headers: The title header and document headers are not consistent across the various fact sheets. **To be reconciled by Communication team. Edited headers for clarity.**

Too much background/intro text: In general, much of the background text could be made briefer. This may allow for a larger font size and greater readability. **To be reconciled by Communication team**

State document purpose: The opening should clearly explain the document purpose in 3 or 4 sentences. We understand that the purpose was to inform local decision-makers of (1) the benefits of WIP Best Management Practices to the primary Chesapeake Bay Agreement Goal (e.g. Stream Health, Protected Lands, etc.), and (2) explain how several BMPs are of co-benefit for other related CBA goals. **Correct. No purpose statement was included because we felt it would be duplicative across all fact sheets. Space considerations also limit purpose statements to header and subheader content.** A link to the Goal Team webpage can be included, and would be a better way to provide the background information currently in the 1st section. **Included a link to TCW webpage under Tools and Resources** It would also be helpful to include (briefly) why the set of 'additional co-benefits' in the chart were chosen. **Added a third table footnote explaining reasoning for inclusion of stream health, forage fish, and citizen stewardship with toxic contaminants co-benefits.**

Charts: The information in the charts is essentially the purpose of the entire document in a picture, however there is almost no explanation provided. The charts should not be included without a narrative explanation of why they are what they are. There should be more detail explaining the charts, because the numbers seem arbitrary. Rather than reference a Tetra Tech document, the fact sheets should dedicate the most page space to neatly summarizing what the actual values mean. For example, in a sentence or 2, explain why 'urban growth reduction' is of such low benefit to wetlands. Readers shouldn't have to dig through the 50 page Tetra Tech report to get a basic understanding of the main point of the fact sheet. **Objective was to keep fact sheet to only a couple of pages. We don't see a way to add this requested information within the factsheet format.**

