



Management Board

March 13, 2025

Outcome Review - Clarifying Questions

Student Outcome:

1. In the second sentence, what do you mean by “at least one MWEE each in elementary, middle, and high school?” (EPA)

Sustainable Schools Outcome: N/A

Environmental Literacy Outcome: N/A

Diversity/Workforce Outcome:

1. For Workforce replacement, would you consider changing "partner priorities" to "outcomes" or "Agreement goals and outcomes" to better define what we mean by partner priorities? (CBC)
2. What steps will be taken to develop quantifiable metrics and to make this new outcome SMART? It seems to be a combination of an outcome and an output. Also, would it be possible to narrow the focus within a “regional workforce”? (EPA)

Public Access Site Development Outcome:

1. We are interested in whether the expanded metrics would include tracking location and spread of access points for the purpose of finding potential gaps, not just the overall number. (CBC)
2. What are the plans to build these enhanced tracking metrics into this outcome? And what resources are needed/anticipated to support the expanded scope of this outcome? (EPA)

Protected Lands Outcome:

1. Have you considered broadening the "highest value for water quality" language to include living resource response and resilience? And how would we balance a focus on large landscape conservation and the goal of conserving smaller pockets of habitat in particularly sensitive or developed areas? We appreciate the recommendation of prioritizing many types of important landscapes and looking at how the protected lands outcome can work with other associated outcomes like wetlands to help

communicate the value of these habitats. Our concern would be if we move in the direction of adding many, very specific outputs or targets for each of these landscape types. (CBC)

2. Can this include smaller parcels of land or is it just focused on large landscapes? (Stakeholders)
3. What are the plans to enhance funding further, alongside continued Watershed Agreement inclusion, to support this outcome? Do you anticipate developing metrics for each individual land use classification? What resources are needed/anticipated to support expanding the scope of this outcome? (EPA)

Toxic Contaminants Research Outcome:

1. Should the research outcome be reclassified as an output for the "policy and prevention outcome"? (DC DOEE)
2. Is this primarily focused on the estuary or does it also apply to river and streams? Can it include herbicides and pesticides that EPA studies show are prevalent throughout the watershed? (Stakeholders)
3. Have there been any discussions to reclassify this outcome as an output and include under the toxic contaminants policy and prevention outcome? (EPA)

Toxic Contaminants Policy and Prevention Outcome:

1. We would be interested in discussing whether to combine the Research and Policy & Prevention outcomes into one research and reduction outcome and drafting that combined outcome to prioritize coordination and collaboration on PCBs, PFAS, plastics, and other emerging contaminants identified by the Program as a priority. (CBC)
2. Why would we be singling out PCBs (as opposed to toxics in general)? Are microplastics included in toxic contaminants (DC would advocate that they should be)? Why would we reclassify this under fisheries as opposed to water quality? (DC DOEE)
3. Is this primarily focused on the estuary or does it also apply to rivers and streams? Can it include herbicides and pesticides that EPA studies show are prevalent throughout the watershed? (Stakeholders)
4. Would the focal TCs of this outcome remain PCBs, or would it expand to include others? (EPA)

Wetlands Outcome

1. What does it mean to "offset" tidal wetlands (why not maintain?); are these "included" items going to be part of the outcome or are they considerations? (DC DOEE)
2. What are the specific targets being considered for the TW outcome (i.e., maintain tidal wetland acreage at X by 2050)? Is 10% every 25 years the agreed-upon target for NW increase? What is the scientific justification for the targets? Seeing draft language for the outcomes would support further evaluation. Have there been any discussions about keeping one wetlands outcome but having a tidal wetlands output and a nontidal wetlands output? (EPA)

Black Duck Outcome:

1. Agree with reclassifying, but it seems that Black Ducks would be used as an indicator, not an output. (CBC)
2. What is the justification for reclassifying as an output rather than an indicator? For which proposed wetlands outcome would black duck be an indicator (tidal/nontidal/both)? (EPA)

Submerged Aquatic Vegetation Outcome:

1. Have there been discussions about this outcome becoming an indicator under the water quality goal and associated outcome? (EPA)

Monitoring and Assessment Outcome

1. By replace, just making sure you mean that a differently focused outcome would be substituted in its place, one that looks at internal science integration. (CBC)
2. Is this going to be an outcome, or is this a stand-alone framework similar to an implementation plan? Do climate resiliency and climate adaptation have concrete differences in the resulting programming? (DC DOEE)
3. Is this primarily focused on the estuary or does it also apply to rivers and streams? (Stakeholders)

Adaptation Outcome

1. We're concerned that, like the land use recommendation, this may be trying to tackle the "SMART" problem by heading too far towards direct design and construction of local resilience implementation rather than a hub where local communities can come for planning and information sharing. We would feel more comfortable if this was focused on facilitation of options and assistance. That would seem the better role for the Program/partnership at a regional level. (CBC)
2. What are the 6 areas? Physical or theoretical? How would they be chosen? What does place-based mean in this context? (DC DOEE)
3. Is this primarily focused on the estuary or does it also apply to rivers and streams? (Stakeholders)