| Action | Contact/Comments | Revised Action |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Management Approach 1 |  |  |
| Action related to Chessie BIBI included:   * Develop method to track and report Chessie BIBI in stream miles | * Claire Buchanan Added actions to reflect status of refinement and update of Chessie BIBI * Update of timeline to refine and update Chessie BIBI * Need to assign task and funding to update Chessie BIBI/trend analysis post 2008 baseline | * 3 actions and revised text related to BIBI: * **\*New\***Update and refine the Chesapeake Bay Basin-wide Index of Biotic Integrity (“Chessie BIBI”) for streams * Establish 2008 baseline and approach for determining future trends (% change) * **\*New\*** Determine and report progress |
| * Align metrics of functional lift with stream restoration protocols crediting projects for the Chesapeake Bay TMDL for nutrient and sediment reduction by incorporating recommendations from BMP Verification Committee for stream restoration into state Verification Plans | No comments received |  |
| Management Approach 2 |  |  |
| * Secure funding source to implement pooled monitoring approach throughout Chesapeake Bay watershed | Jana Davis, edited to align with current efforts underway with Chesapeake Bay Trust Ad Hoc Pooled Monitoring committee  Removed performance target “Hold Bay wide stream monitoring charrette to align existing monitoring efforts and inform pooled monitoring approach”. Added as separate action  VA DEQ (Sarah Woodford, Tish Robertson) support for pooled monitoring approach, information gathering stage on what it would mean to VA. See similarities/potential with data clearinghouse for water quality data. | Implement pooled monitoring approach throughout Chesapeake Bay watershed.  See workplan for revised performance targets and parties responsible |
| * Secure funding source to implement pooled monitoring approach throughout Chesapeake Bay watershed | * Rich Starr, Neely Law added new action to address performance target deleted from this action stating, “Hold Bay wide stream monitoring charrette to align existing monitoring efforts and inform pooled monitoring approach based on input from recent stream restoration meetings (MD USGS, Monitoring Sub-Committee of MWMC) * VA DEQ important to know what data we have now and its use. Potential tie into ‘minimum stability monitoring’ action | **\* New action\*** “Identify use and best application of current and research-based monitoring efforts to advance implementation of stream restoration practices and projects” |
| Management Approach 3 |  |  |
| * Develop a “Stream Restoration Permit Committee” of the Stream Health Work Group that brings practitioners and the regulated community together in a consensus-building forum to identify actions to streamline the stream restoration project permit review process | Jim Haggerty, Preference to modify wording related to “Consensus-building forum”. Agreed need to work together to identify appropriate review streamlining actions  VA DEQ (Sarah Woodford) like to see this action, if no lead identified for a SHWG committee, look for potential to discuss within the Work Group | Develop a “Stream Restoration Permit Committee” of the Stream Health Work Group that brings practitioners, regulators and the regulated community together to resolve issues and find common ground to identify actions to streamline the stream restoration project permit review process  - Word change consistent with scope and purpose of SHWG |
| * Work with federal and state regulatory agencies to develop recommendations to accept site identification in a WIP, MS4 restoration plan or other relevant site analyses as sufficient for a feasibility analysis for stream restoration permits | * SHWG 09/08/15 meeting, add ‘regulators’ and remove design alternatives analysis as part of performance targets * Jim Haggerty/US ACE Baltimore District, Feasibility analysis” wording removed. It may cause some confusion with the USACE process for implementing approved federal projects” * VA DEQ interest given feedback from funding agencies re site selection and monitoring. Add’l comments forthcoming | Work with federal, state regulatory agencies and local governments to develop recommendations to accept WIPs, MS4 restoration plan or other relevant site analyses as sufficient documentation for alternative site analysis in support of stream restoration permits |
| * Develop an administrative review process that sets a 90 day turn-around time for permit issuance given specific administrative criteria | Initial action provided by E. Michelson  Comments Jim Haggerty,  USACE Regulatory has existing OMB-approved metrics for timeliness of permit processing that districts lack the authority to modify | Action deleted as per comments from Corps but pending response and further discussion as follow-up from Sept 8 SHWG meeting and discussions with MDE as per letter 9/14/15  Potential to incorporate into “streamline permit review process” below based on input from MDE 9/14/15 letter. Further discussions needed. |
| * Develop a streamlined permit review process, which does not require changes to existing Federal and state laws and regulations, for stream restoration projects. | Jim Haggerty/US ACE Baltimore District, District offices don’t have authority to develop separate track for restoration permitting; change in regulations  Streamlining could also mean training opportunities for review staff. E.g. VA DEQ (Woodford) noted internal technical training n stream restoration topics hosted and coordinated by VADEQ | Develop a streamlined permit review process, which does not require changes to existing Federal and state laws and regulations, for stream restoration projects. |
| Same as above | Fred Kelly, Provided letter from MDE (dated 9/14/15) to Maryland Association of Counties referencing intent and actions to streamline permit review process that would not require changes in regulations | Further discussions and clarification requested from MDE and interest from other Bay jurisdictions to pursue action needed |
| * Establish minimum stability monitoring requirements for restoration projects | * SHWG Sept meeting, add “Coordinate this effort with BMP verification methods” in the performance targets * Comments from Corps forthcoming. * Support from VA DEQ, interest and notes good tie in with review of current data/monitoring efforts and how their best application | See added txt for performance target |
| Management Approach 4 |  |  |
| * Establish joint SHWG and USWG work group as per STAC recommendation to develop guidance (e.g., via an expert panel) to align how the restoration/enhancement of stream functions translates to nitrogen, phosphorus, and sediment “credit‟ . Also use work group to address other technical issues identified in STAC Workshop on Sustainable Stream Restoration. | No comments |  |
| * Reconciling Sediment TMDLs with other stressors identified by Stressor Identification Methods to assure sediment TMDLs implemented under MS4 permits address multiple stressors | VA DEQ (Tish Roberston, S. Woodford), May be opportunity to coordinate with VA TMDL and monitoring programs along with MDE. Follow-up contact to be provided. | Revision pending further discussion |
| * Provide stream training to regulators and practitioners | No comments (see previous comment from S. Woodford related to streamlining permit process) |  |