

**Management Strategy
Public Input Summary and
Issues for Management Board Consideration**

Fisheries GIT

- **Blue Crab Comments:**

1. Comments from individual citizens suggesting that the harvest of female blue crabs should be further restricted.
2. Comments from Maryland blue crab/fishing industry groups requesting that the strategy more explicitly state the role and jurisdictional rights of the strategy partners.

- **Oyster Comments:**

1. Comments from individual citizens suggesting limiting harvest of wild oysters.
2. Comments from Maryland oyster and fishing industry groups requesting that Oyster Industry/Seafood and the fishing industry be recognized as important participants who should be involved in the restoration planning process. Also requesting that the strategy more explicitly state the role and jurisdictional rights of the strategy partners.
3. Comments from individual citizens promoting aquaculture.

- **Forage Fish Comments:**

1. Very few comments received. Comments from individual citizens on the importance of considering the whole ecosystem and leaving forage fish for the predators.

- **Fish Habitat Comments:**

1. Very few comments received. Comments from private citizens to coordinate efforts with fish barrier removal projects and questions about the impacts of pollution behind Conowingo.

Habitats GIT

- **Wetlands Comments:**

1. Eliminate the practice of wetland mowing
2. Strategy is focused on improving reporting but does not offer a strategy to increase restoration
3. Use dredge materials to create wetlands/encourage development of wetland mitigation banks
4. Develop jurisdiction-specific acreage goals for restoration/enhancement
5. Factors and Targeting/Prioritization tools sections should include climate factors from the Black Duck management strategy and how to leverage targeting efforts for black ducks
6. Expand local engagement section under participating partners
7. Define wetland restoration vs wetland creation and state that wetland restoration (where wetlands historically existed) is typically more successful
8. A discussion and outline should be included on the methods and techniques the partners would use to restore, develop and mitigate wetlands.

- **Black Duck Comments:**

1. Clarify if the current estimate of black duck food availability is sufficient or insufficient to support 100,000 black ducks
2. Strategy needs to estimate how much habitat (by type, condition, size, location) is required to support population objective

3. Black Ducks are supposed to be “indicator” species for other waterfowl. Add text to management approach on the science needed to improve tools and management of black ducks and other waterfowl.

- **Stream Health Comments:**

1. Don't allow waste treatment facilities to open the overflow into streams
2. Regulatory agencies should support local efforts and innovative technology. Grant permits for innovative stream restoration projects that include funding for monitoring, particularly in those streams where restoration data is available to develop the database to support new technology.
3. Agree with the strategy's comments on permitting issues, but addressing them may lead to many more questionable projects being implemented and spending more money on in-channel projects.
4. Look at Macro-invertebrates at a species level to better understand a system response with respect to stressors
5. Needs to be clarified that this is a strategy about gaining understanding, not prioritizing implementation at this point.
6. The 2008 baseline should be more clearly defined and how much functional lift is needed to claim a stream is healthy. Additional research and science is needed to provide better understanding of stream channel processing of nutrients to better quantify load reductions associated with 'healthy' streams.
7. The RGP for TMDL may require so much monitoring data to establish baseline conditions to show uplift that it becomes cost prohibitive. The pooled monitoring efforts should help address some of these issues. Important to note that the proposed RGP only covers MD and DC.
8. Metrics that demonstrate functional uplift need to be determined
9. We should be designing stream restoration projects to promote nitrogen pollutant transformation to gas (denitrification) and phosphorus/sediment storage in floodplain or removal of sediment from floodplain for upland placement.
10. For stream restoration, we need to help steer society's efforts towards remediating principal stressors impairing stream health. To meet nutrient and sediment reduction TMDL, we need to focus on nutrient and sediment stream functions.

- **Brook Trout Comments:**

1. Put a cap on human population growth
2. There needs to be more focus on how science will support management approaches and associated tools
3. Include shale gas drilling as a specific factor influencing
4. Restoration of riparian shade could do much to restore brook trout habitat

- **Fish Passage Comments:**

1. The Gaps need to include science/management gaps beyond funding.
2. Coordinate with the identified fish barrier removal projects in the Anacostia Watershed Restoration Plan

- **SAV Comments:**

1. Increase on the ground efforts
2. Better to align black duck outcome as SAV adjacent to wetlands may be critical for both outcomes

3. Support the Partnership's efforts to protect and restore natural SAV in small estuaries and along the Potomac—not just in the larger Bay
4. The strategy fails to address the question of whether local governments have a general or specific role in achieving the outcome
5. The strategy could be improved by better recognizing and discussing the opportunities and challenges for SAV based on salinity/geographic region.
6. Coordinate efforts with shellfish restoration

STAR

- **Climate Resiliency Comments:**

1. The activities listed in the strategy did not elaborate on how a baseline will be determined.
2. There is a desire to more clearly define the role of local governments and how local governments will get the tools and resources they need to assist with implementation.
3. The management strategy should provide more detail on how exactly the integration of climate change adaptation into all the management strategies will take place.

Water Quality GIT

- **Water Quality / WIPs/Standards Attainment and Monitoring Comments:**

1. The WQGIT received 46 public comments on the Water Quality Management Strategy. Many of the comments requested that we add additional language on verification and local engagement, which we have done. Other comments required a level of detail that is more appropriate to address in the work plans (e.g. additional detail on state-specific source sector strategies that are either included (or will be included) in the two-year milestones or WIP).

- **Forest Buffer Comments:**

1. Comments received from 36 individuals/organizations;
2. Much positive feedback; many suggested additions; and some made points that were already included in the Strategy documents. Some comments were more detailed suggested actions, which we will consider in the workplan development process;
3. Several comments contradicted one another: e.g., 3-4 comments were regarding the need to do more for conservation easements on RFB while one commenter thought that was a distraction.
4. The comments were used to clarify and strengthen the document but nothing was controversial of a nature to bring before the MB.

- **Urban Tree Canopy Comments:**

1. Comments received from 14 individuals/organizations; Clean Water Coalition provided a number of comments
2. Overall positive feedback—some recommended additional language or clarification which we incorporated; others were more detailed suggested actions, which we will consider in the workplan development process;
3. One point to be aware of is the state annual targets table in the Outcome section will need to be revisited during workplan development because they were set back in late 2013 and may need to be adjusted to meet 2025 target

Toxics Contaminants Workgroup

- **Toxic Contaminants Research Comments:**

1. Additional issues of emerging concern (fracking, pesticides)
2. Prioritizing contaminants based on relative risk

3. Management practices (biosolids, WWTP, ag and stormwater benefit)
4. Better connection between research and P&P strategies

- **Toxic Contaminants Policy and Prevention Comments:**

1. Additional contaminants
2. PMPs only when WLA exceeded
3. PCB WLAs in wastewater permits – WQBELs only
4. More data/Emphasis placed on 1668 – adequate/more needed, how to fill any gaps (as done by DRBC), legal context for 1668
5. Suggestion that biosolids may be a source
6. Clarify the purpose of the site cleanup risk criteria action
7. Improvements to TMDLs
8. Feds should undertake voluntary phase-out
9. How do different WQs impact progress

Issue for PSC Consideration:

Several commenters stated that the Policy and Prevention Strategy was incomplete because it does not address contaminants beyond PCBs.

- The outcome was deliberately limited to PCBs as a starting point
- Additional contaminants will be addressed later
- The TCW has begun to work on fact finding for mercury
- An approach for prioritizing other contaminants will be developed

Should additional jurisdiction-specific issues be mentioned, for example cancer lesions on fish in the Susquehanna, micro-plastic beads, etc.?

Healthy Watersheds GIT

- **Healthy Watersheds Comments:**

1. Ensure that the term “healthy waters and watersheds” is defined for each jurisdiction – in particular, expand on definitions as defined by Delaware and D.C.
2. Highlight the importance of state and federal actions and programs that alter land use, and need to influence such activities as we also attempt to help local governments become better stewards for healthy watershed maintenance.
3. Suggestions related to changing or adding words and sentences, clarifying points, moving paragraphs to more appropriate sections and adding new headings.
4. Suggestions related to adding, removing or expanding on examples and references focused on healthy watershed protection and benefits.
5. Other supportive comments.

- **Land Use Methods/Metrics Comments:**

1. Suggestions related to changing or adding text and sentences, defining terms, including other examples, information and groups to engage with.
2. Clarify the role of local governments.
3. Question whether the intent is to measure all types of land conversion.
4. Other supportive comments that justify the need for this outcome.

- **Land Use Options Comments:**

1. There were no comments to substantially change the management strategy approach.
2. Suggestions related to changing or adding text and sentences, defining terms, including other examples, information and groups to engage with.
3. Make specific points, such as the need to harmonize economic development objectives with environmental objectives, design tax incentives to discourage land conversion in some areas and encourage it in other areas, address the problem of an aging population in working lands and other challenges, etc.
4. Other supportive comments that justify the need for this outcome.

Stewardship GIT

- **Citizen Stewardship Comments:**

1. Partners need to learn the social, economic, environmental priority issues and find innovative ways to assist using environmental principles that also meet CBP priorities.
2. To convert volunteerism to lifelong stewardship, in underserved communities in particular, students must be engaged in volunteerism that connects with education, community enrichment, as well as economic success. Volunteer programs must also engage students with internships, jobs, and college programs related to Bay restoration.
3. Support in developing methodology to measure and track citizen stewards.
4. Encourage and support partnerships between NGOs and local governments to support local governments efforts including permit implementation.
5. Balance priority setting and targeting through processes that adequately reflects the need of a community while also weighing impact on local environmental condition.

- **Protected Lands Comments:**

1. Need, interest and support for additional resources and staffing in order to achieve protected lands outcome and strategy approaches.
2. Need for increased specificity in the strategy on groups that will be targeted for communication to increase public awareness of land conservation.
3. Clarify and add more detail regarding Landscape future data layers and function.
4. Incorporate factors such as changes in land use and climate change into management approach.

- **Public Access Comments:**

1. Include Environmental Literacy in the cross-goal collaboration
2. Set a goal or target of increasing the percentage of Bay watershed shoreline in each state that is publicly accessible
3. Camping access should be added to the types of access that will be tracked toward meeting the current 300-site goal
4. Create an inventory of all the bridges crossing navigable and fishable rivers and streams
5. Include obstructions such as high guard rails, fences, and lack of parking as factors limiting access
6. All bridge construction and reconstruction projects currently in the planning and design process should be reviewed to ensure that waterway access is incorporated into planned construction or reconstruction
7. Federal agencies with land holdings along the shorelines of the Chesapeake watershed should be required to develop a plan, schedule and process for enhancing public water-based access at their facilities
8. Department of Defense should clean up contaminated sites

9. Army Corps of Engineers should explore enhancing public water-based recreation in the Chesapeake watershed associated with its navigation and public works projects.
10. Ensure that stormwater management techniques does not become a deterrent for public access to the waterway
11. Seek innovative solutions and partnerships and highlight models of success that create new public water access.
12. Federal and state partners should make funding for public water access a priority
13. New Public Access Sites Should Be Prioritized For Development in Urban Areas
14. Federal and state agencies should also provide local communities resources on managing conflicts among users
15. We recommend that federal and state agencies provide technical assistance and resources to localities and to approach local businesses when pursuing public water access projects.
16. The strategy should foster reopening existing public access sites where access has been unlawfully limited
17. The Commonwealth of Virginia Should Protect Citizens' Right to Fish, Wade and Float
18. The Strategy Should Focus on Preventing and Reversing Private Dedications of Public Rights-of-way
19. Engage local businesses partners
20. Bring attention to the access residents have to local streams and rivers

- **Environmental Literacy Comments:**

1. US Department of Education should be included as an official partner of the Chesapeake Bay Program
2. Partnership should coordinate environmental literacy efforts at the state and local level
3. A management approach should include an employment and professional engagement workgroup
4. Strategy should support afterschool programs and other non-formal education opportunities

Issue for PSC Consideration:

CAC continues to recommend that the U.S. Department of Education become an official partner with the Bay Program to assist states and local governments in achieving the Environmental Literacy goal by providing federal resources through existing programs to support Environmental Literacy. Among the best opportunities to advance Environmental Literacy is through the Next Generation Science Standards, Common Core or similar state standards, and STEM, and U.S. Dept. of Education can provide financial support to develop Environmental Literacy. **How can the PSC help facilitate Departments of Education participation?**

Diversity Workgroup

- **Diversity Strategy Comments:**

1. Support and expand on successful local programs/projects
2. Enhance baseline section – need more non-profit information in particular
3. CBP Partners should work with local community leaders to address “self-identified community concerns” – address social, economic, and environmental concerns at nexus points
4. Collaborate with environmental justice entities and recruit from minority serving institutions in the Bay region to achieve diversity goals

GIT 6

- **Local Leadership Comments:**

1. Lacks detail and needs to include more specific and targeted actions
2. Needs more emphasis on cross-outcome collaboration
3. Edit the document for clarity and readability
4. Seek input from local officials before developing the workplan

Issue for PSC Consideration:

Several concerns have been raised related to this and other management strategies:

1. There is confusion about what this strategy is supposed to do in relation to the others strategies (particularly water quality). Local leaders need awareness, information and knowledge on all these natural resource issues. Local action through innovation will be key to achieving the Bay Agreement goals.
2. Where will increased resources be coming from for new areas of CBP emphasis? We are already seeing some problems. We suggest that there be standard wording in all management strategies in the workplan section that suggests that (1) not all management activities will be started right away, but will be prioritized based on need and available resources, and (2) the workplan is intended to be highlighting what will be done by all participating signatories and interested stakeholders using pertinent, available funding and other resources to achieve workplan outcomes.

How can the PSC help encourage resources (staffing and other resources) will be available to implement these strategies?