



Management Board
February 13, 2025
Outcome Review – Clarifying Questions

Oysters Outcome

Was the 2-pager supposed to include what the proposed updated outcome would be? 2) Contrary to the 2-pager (response 10), oysters are not iconic for the vast majority of watershed residents. Accordingly, the Sustainable Fisheries Goal, which includes the generic term "Shellfish" needs to be expanded to other species of shellfish including freshwater clams and mussels endemic to freshwater streams and saltwater ribbed mussels so that the goal resonates with people locally. When will expansion of the Goal to include other outcomes be considered? (DoD)

Can you clarify what "conserve" means in the context of oyster restoration? Are there differences between jurisdictions? Should proposed education and outreach activities be included in the Outcome language, or are these intended as Outputs? (EPA)

Blue Crab Abundance Outcome

How might an Update to this Outcome change the narrative around the variation and potential vulnerability that blue crab abundance experiences due to oceanic and habitat changes in the Bay as a result of climate change? Could it include language about the impacts of climate change/changing weather patterns on oceanic conditions and currents on crab larval development, as disruptions to conditions in the ocean that are necessary for crab development could decimate bay crab populations even if the habitat is perfect? (MD DNR)

Can you clarify the intention of including climate change in the Outcome language? Does this need to be explicitly called out in the Outcome language? How will Outcome leads ensure language revisions are SMART? (EPA)

Forage Fish Outcome

Rather than removing this outcome, it would seem to fit nicely into the Fish Habitat Outcome (which already references forage fish), so perhaps these two should be combined under a new unifying heading like "Fish Health." (DoD)

If the goal was changed so that "how much forage is there and is it enough" was addressed, would that be a more productive avenue worth continuing to explore as an Outcome? (MD DNR)

Fish Habitat Outcome

The two-pager seems only to be focused on the tidal portion of the Bay and its tributaries. Was this outcome meant to include freshwater streams in the watershed? Response #9 makes me think there is value in considering temperature as part of water quality since temperature is significantly impacting both (freshwater) brook trout and (saltwater) striped bass habitats regardless of other measures of water quality. I'm glad there is interest in "cooling" BMPs and riparian forests that provide shade to mitigate some of the effects of increased water temperature.

To what extent is it possible to add more specificity when discussing fish habitat, as this is an inherently generic term? I.e. which fish species are being prioritized and are habitats for critical life history stages being addressed versus habitat for those life history stages that are ""more visible"" to the general public? (DoD)

Will root causes of fish habitat degradation be identified and addressed as part of this Outcome? These will vary by location and could range from mechanical disturbance/removal to changing climate to watershed development. (MD DNR)

What other outcome are they recommending to consolidate with? (VA)

Fish Passage Outcome

You address it in your response, but have you considered explicitly including "flood reduction" in the list of public benefits identified in the Vital Habitats Goal. This could allow for other or more enhanced collaborations and funding sources dedicated towards flood mitigation (ex: FEMA, State DOTs) as opposed to environmental benefits (but with a common result). (DoD)

Regarding the recommendation for expanding the scope to include non-physical barrier, this would appear to be a rather large expansion of scope into water quality. Have you considered how participation by management agencies would need to shift to account for this expansion, potentially pulling focus from physical barriers? Might this be too much to fit into one outcome? (CBC)

How was the increase from 132-150 miles calculated? Does this account for year-to-year variability of dam removal? (VA)

Local Leadership Outcome

How can the Local Government Advisory Committee's work as an advisor to the Management Board be further enhanced and tied to this Outcome? How can the Goal team/workgroup become more inclusive and relatable to all communities and local governments? (MD DNR)

I am looking for clarity as to why "update" was recommended versus "replace". What role can LGAC play here? (VA)