



Habitat Goal Implementation Team
November Steering Committee Minutes
November 21, 2013
2:00-3:30 PM

Participants: Mike Slattery (Chair, FWS), Jana Davis (Vice-Chair, CBTrust), Jennifer Greiner (Coordinator, FWS), Hannah Martin (Staffer, CRC), Mary Andrews (NOAA), Tai Chang (FWS), Tuana Phillips (CRC, GIT4), Deb Hopkins (FWS), Sadie Drescher (CWP), Karl Lutz (PA FBC), Julie Mawhorter (USFS), Lee Karrh (MDNR), Jim Hedrick (WVDNR), Neely Law (CWP), Denise Clearwater (MDE), Bernie Marczyk (DU), Julie Winters (EPA)

Action Items:

- All- prepare for Stream and Wetland BMP protocols to review in nearly final form and provide comments.
- All- work with Management Board representative if you have comments on new Watershed Agreement by Dec 20th

Minutes

1. Mike's Opening Comments

- More than \$10 million in BT projects put on the ground (\$6 million in grants, \$4 in match)
- DU and TNC received NFWF funding to work toward wetland goal
- Outcome statements and see how they could align with new Watershed Agreement, not seamless transition. Heated discussions among jurisdictions and agencies. Habitat GIT outcomes in new Agreement—only team that had systemic and consistent and universal approval.

2. Update on new Watershed Agreement, EO deliverables

- There is text for new Watershed Agreement. PSC met on Nov8th about the draft and approved it for a 6 week review comment period. Comments by signatories are due no later than Dec 20th. Work through state MB representative by Dec 20th. Public comment period (6 weeks) during Jan/Feb. Finalized in early 2014.
- Under EO, required by federal partnership, are action plan (what we will do as fed partners in CB) and progress report for OMB and CEQ what has been done. Content for those are underway and working toward finality—issued in draft next week before Thanksgiving. Numeric and programmatic milestones.
- Discussion/Questions? None.

3. Update regarding Stream Health Workgroup and BMP verification protocols

- Neely—the CWP as sediment and stream coordinator provide technical support. Bill is working with Rich and Jeff Horan developing bmp verification principles for stream restoration projects. Met in august to provide review of draft. Received comments back and they are requesting changes/revisions to principles to better align as “good template” submitted by urban stormwater workgroup.
- ACTION: Habitat GIT will have opportunity to review and provide comment on BMP protocols for stream and wetlands. These protocols are to serve as practical guidance that leads to verifiable BMPs that would incentivize restoration practices.

4. Team Functionality, effectiveness and value of members’ engagement

- Need to develop a shared value or understanding what the Habitat GIT involvement includes. Frame overarching design for implementation of priority habitat considerations in a strategic context.
- MB and PSC—feels as though federal members are driving the process. Light on the priorities of jurisdictions and state representation.
- Mike talked to many steering committee members. Feedback: we don’t have shared vision and shared action agenda. Some tension that priorities and activities driven solely by Bay Program process.
- Jana: potential other model—steering committee is smaller, but work is bigger.
 - Denise: support from jurisdictions would be welcome. Useful to have someone knowing what is going on with all the workgroups and teams and overlap.
 - Jennifer: coord/staffer meeting could be a good forum
 - Mike: exchange across GIT chairs as well.
 - Enhanced communication.
 - Lee : we have fair state of state representation. SC may be too big. Top down model-SAV would like to hear what they should be working on since they do not have projects to work. Identify topics of interest from MB down and workgroups up.
 - Mary: Fish passage workgroup has done well because the group has collective interests outside bay program—not dictated by bay program to meet for administrative responsibilities. Meet to discuss things of interest outside of the program.
 - Mike: Fish GIT-as resource managers, came together because of EO, but had more in common than just EO topics. The Habitat GIT needs to organize our work by having a reason of existing beyond CBP tasks.
- Conclusion: No one supports the Steering Committee as functional entity of Habitat GIT. Next call will decide on composition of the Habitat GIT.

5. Update on other GIT collaboration

- Jennifer: a lot of discussions on how GITs can be more collaborative. GIT1 (Fish), GIT4 (Healthy Watersheds), GIT2 (Habitat), and GIT5 (Stewardship).

- Conversations:
 - 1. Want to identify projects/initiatives some of have ongoing that lend themselves to joint work across GITS
 - Oysters as habitat and restoration (validate oyster restoration as a BMP in model). Create markets to finance oyster restoration and oyster removal.
 - Shared interest in developing vision for collaborative land and water conservation design. Lend itself well to offering direction teams (like SAV workgroup) and illuminate priority locations in watershed and opportunities for policy driven investments.
 - Mary: lofty goals, difficult time doing is producing that plan---good ideas but falls apart when designating people responsible to produce that work.
 - Mike: make map of layers—we had folks come together from EBTJV under EO guidance (not CBP driven). Climate change and other stressors—buy in from agencies in basin, resources outside CBP that would help support Bay Program.
 - Jennifer: GIT 4 over past year succeeded in creating map of jurisdictions (agreed by jurisdictions to be posted on bay program) network of lands in conservation considered to be healthy watersheds or healthy streams to be protected. “keep the good good” we could come up with a restoration complement. Start with wetland initiative project.
 - FWS Science Applications work closely with LCCs. Interest in taking closer look at CB wildlife action plans.
 - Lee: look at map of where the money is going (i.e. Harris Creek)
 - Mike: let’s look at where we are concentrating efforts now and use that as a way of further prioritizing where we are choosing to do the work.
 - Jennifer: CBP has GIS team, modeling, and communications.
 - Mike: GITS are interested in strategic driving NFWF Stewardship funding. Recruit strong proposals by partners envisioned by goal teams.

Winter Meeting Agenda

- 1 or 1.5 day?
 - Julie: personally like the field visit, but this year travel \$\$ are tight.
- Jan 22-23?
 - Lee-last week of January.
 - Jana is busy Jan 22-23.
 - Jim-fisheries society meeting Jan 22 and 23
 - Jennifer: maybe move to February.
- Team Membership, operations and accountability
- Reg process update
 - Folks appreciate this topic a lot. Worthwhile topic and use of our time.
- Bring BMPs to life

- Generate credit for things that don't have it. New environmental markets and profitable credit trading.
- Project implementation through creative leveraging funding sources
- Wetland initiative
 - Stewardship fund grant
- Forestry updates
- Forage fish sustainability
- Stream health WG and STAC workshop
- Black Duck Energetics Modeling
- Brook Trout Strategic Plan and Geographic Targeting
- Integrating operations across habitat, fisheries, HW and stewardship GITS
- Potential Location

Julie: likes other GITs, like the list

Lee: interest in forage fish topic and black duck energetics.

Jana: like the idea of engaging other GITs and policy pieces on EP, more communication across GITs.

Next Call : Dec 19th.

-Karl: interested in reg update. Struggling to set priorities between habitat and fish folks. Where should we be working?

-Jennifer and Jana organize the theme of setting priorities. Synergies.

- Jana: Updates and what you need the GIT to do—last Nov we worked on something and product was document sent to CBP.
- Endeavor to find synergies and frame in a product/activity.