Contents

Please note: This document is provided for awareness and to help solicit feedback from the WQGIT; everything is deliberative and subject to change.

Background: Instructions provided post-retreat

Development of Projects List
Phase 2 Continuing Implementation

Introduction

The Beyond 2025 Steering Committee identified a series of recommendations for improving the Chesapeake Bay Program's efforts in the areas of Science, Conservation and Restoration, and Partnership in its report, A Critical Path Forward for the Chesapeake Bay Program Partnership Beyond 2025. As the partnership initiates efforts towards completing the Executive Council's Charge for Phase 2, the Principles Staff Committee (PSC) and Management Board (MB) are providing guidance to assist partnership bodies in addressing these recommendations while balancing efforts towards meeting Watershed Agreement goals and outcomes. Understanding staffing and resource constraints, the intention is to ensure that partnership resources are focused on efforts critical to furthering progress and which support the partnership's evaluations of outcomes and the CBP structure and governance and management framework. Recommendations from the Steering Committee report and the Small Groups can be translated into projects or initiatives for the goal teams and workgroups to pursue as partnership executes on the top-line directives of the EC Charge for Phase 2.

Considerations for Submitting Projects List/ Roles and Responsibilities

Each goal team is asked to coordinate with workgroups and other associated partnership bodies to submit a list of projects to the MB by January 3rd, 2024 for their consideration. These submissions should describe forward-looking actions that the goals teams/workgroups have identified from the phase 1 report, small group recommendations, or other partnership reports (e.g., the Charting a Course to 2025 Report) as priorities for advancing their focus areas and which they are proposing to take on over the coming year. If an action is represented in an outcome management strategy and/or workplan, please indicate as such. Currently, no new resources have been slated for these efforts. It is the expectation that goal teams/workgroups will set aside activities that may currently be under way and prioritize staff time towards assignments that come from the PSC/MB.

Entries submitted by the initial deadline will be considered a draft list, with the expectation that additional activities will be identified over time and reviewed by the MB on a regular cycle. The MB will review proposals at its January 16th meeting and discuss a process for reviewing and managing this work with the goal teams. This framework for prioritizing the "continuing implementation" work of the partnership will continue to evolve to provide a more strategic and consistent project cycle and clear expectations for goal team/workgroup activities.

Multiple Outcomes

Iterative development of ecosystem service estimates to better inform partners' decision-making to maximize the benefits of conservation, planning and restoration efforts

Task Name	Iterative development of ecosystem service estimates to better inform partners' decision-making to maximize the benefits of conservation, planning and restoration efforts
Group Assigned	STAR/USGS (GSAT) to start
Task Description	To begin expanding tools and information available about the estimated value and multiple benefits associated with LULC or BMPs. This starts with the shorter-term Recommendations from the STAC Ecosystem Services Report (2023) as able with available resources and to build foundation for continued iterative work post-2025.
Task Rationale	**Many recommendations within the Steering Committee Report** and the small group recommendations refer to the cross-partnership of developing approaches to better incentivize practices that maximize ecosystem services and their benefits to living resources and people. Over time, the iterative compilation and sharing of this information will enable conservation and restoration efforts to be translated into multiple benefits that are more likely to be salient to different audiences (see Science Recs 2 and 3; Restoration and Conservation 1 and 3; Partnership Rec 3). The approach could also support efforts to promote carbon stewardship actions to increase the carbon storage and sequestration benefits of watershed restoration.
Related Outcome	Multiple outcomes
Task Outcome/ "End" User	Local or state planners and analysts; watershed or conservation organizations; communicators; by extension: funders; decision-makers or local officials
Assignment (Objective)	More information available in STAC (2023) 1. Development of methods to quantify priority ecosystem services across the watershed. This could include replicating Maryland's ecosystem service estimate methods based on land cover (Greenprint) to the full watershed (or state-by-state as able) 2. Continue incorporation of available BMP-specific data into CAST as able, e.g., carbon sequestration from USDA COMET
MB Champion:	TBD (suggest Maryland plus one other)
Coordination Requirements (MB check-in frequency)	May require dedicated coordination and periodic check-ins based on MB interest and capacity
Delivery Date (Month or Quarter / Year)	First iterative steps by end of 2026 or sooner depending on start date
CBPO Support	USGS (GSAT) + other relevant staff as able

[Back to top]

Assessment of BMPs as heaters and coolers for local waters[1]

Task Name	**Assessment of BMPs as heaters and coolers for local waters**
Group Assigned	Sponsored by WQGIT
Task Description	Through the expert elicitation workshop, the project would provide a comprehensive set of information on the water temperature impacts of BMPs. The project would also result in a communications product for managers to help them better understand the water temperature and ecological implications of their BMP selection. Ultimately the project would aim to increase implementation of cooler BMPs over heater BMPs.
Task Rationale	The STAC Rising Water Temperatures report recommends that moving beyond 2025, the Bay Program should consider how to incorporate water temperature more explicitly into the goals, outcomes and management strategies of the partnership to better achieve water quality goals. This project would fill a critical information gap, providing the WQ GIT with information needed to help managers prioritize the implementation of "cooler" BMPs. This would help ensure our water quality restoration work isn't further exacerbating the impacts of climate and land use change on aquatic ecosystems by further heating waterways, particularly in sensitive watersheds.
Related Outcome	Multiple goals and outcomes
Task Outcome/ "End" User	Local or state planners and analysts; watershed or conservation organizations; communicators; funders; decision-makers (managers or local officials selecting BMPs for implementation)

Assignment (Objective)	• use an expert elicitation process to more systematically evaluate the effects of BMPs on water temperature throughout the watershed.
	  ○ convene an expert elicitation workshop,
	  ○ analyze the data from the workshop and synthesize findings into a communications product for managers regarding the temperature impacts of BMPs.
	• This project would build on current USGS research efforts to evaluate the co-benefits of BMPs for stream health, including water temperature impacts, by improving and expanding out an expert elicitation process currently being conducted in smaller watersheds.

MB Champion:	
Coordination Requirements (MB check-in frequency)	On request; as project nears completion
Delivery Date (Month or Quarter / Year)	
CBPO Support	FY24 GIT Funding - USGS

[Back to top]

Living Resource Outcome Measurement

Task Name	Living Resource Outcome Measurement
Group Assigned	Fisheries GIT/WQGIT/workgroups
Task Description	Develop metrics to allow for progress measurement of effects to improve Priority Living Resource Habitat areas.
Task Rationale	CESR report suggests that focus should be given to shallow waters/living resources in addition to meeting the goals of the Bay TMDL. There is an effort underway to identify Priority Living Resource Habitat areas. Our current method of evaluating annual progress based on nutrient load reductions may not be suited to measure progress toward improving habitat. In addition, both the CESR report and the Clean Water Small Group recommendations suggest that the Partnership look to measure outcomes vs. load reductions. The Partnership need to have a way to measure progress of habitat improvement.
Related Outcome	Multiple goals and outcomes
Task Outcome/ "End" User	Overall Partnership, implementors of WIPs/milestones,
Assignment (Objective)	Determine ways/provide options to measure habitat improvement through time. • Develop options to track the effects of restoration (both physical land change/habitat modifications and traditional Water Quality BMPs,) • Develop options to show how WQ BMPs are tracked against local targets • Develop methods to measure specific outcomes
MB Champion:	
Coordination Requirements (MB check-in frequency)	Quarterly check-in with MB on progress –
Delivery Date (Month or Quarter / Year)	January 1, 2026 – Draft Recommendation on outcome measurement July 1, 2026 - final recommendations on outcome measurement
CBPO Support	Living Resource Data Manager, GIS Team

[Back to top]

Priority Living Resource Habitat Area – identification/quantification.

Task Name	Priority Living Resource Habitat Area – identification/quantification
Group Assigned	Fisheries GIT
Task Description	Develop Priority Living Resource Habitat Areas for 92 segments of the Tidal Bay
Task Rationale	CESR report suggests that focus should be given to shallow waters/living resources in addition to meeting the goals of the Bay TMDL. This activity will identify priority living resource areas and give scoring metrics to assist in prioritization of restoration and conservations efforts.
Related Outcome	
Task Outcome/ "End" User	WIP/Milestone Developers - Will provide critical information to allow/support **tiered implementation targets/focused restoration efforts**

Assignment (Objective)	Develop a habitat suitability model that focuses on shallow water
	• Select species/life stages representative of Bay LR
	• Determine appropriate habitat variables to evaluate for the above
	  ○ Water quality
	  ○ Physical characteristics
	  ○ Temperature
	  ○ Etc.
	• Develop habitat rating/scoring for geographic area's of the bay (all 92 segments)
	• Develop GIS based data visualization of LR habitat suitability at the highest resolution available.

MB Champion:	VA/MD/DC should have oversight
Coordination Requirements (MB check-in frequency)	• January 1, 2026 – draft habitat suitability model complete • July 1, 2026 – habitat suitability scoring matrix complete • January 1, 2027 - data visualization tool to utilize suitability model and scoring matrix complete • Should be reported on with Tiered Implementation Targets • Should be reported on with Priority Living Resource Scoring Matrix
Delivery Date (Month or Quarter / Year)	January 1, 2027
CBPO Support	GIS Team, Modeling Team, LR data manager

[Back to top]

Forest Buffers or Tree Canopy

Advancing Conservation of Riparian Forest Buffers and Urban Tree Canopy

Task Name	Advancing Conservation of Riparian Forest Buffers and Urban Tree Canopy
Group Assigned	Forestry Workgroup
Task Description	Research conservation policies and incentive programs used in the Chesapeake Bay and other states/localities to reduce forest buffer and tree canopy loss. The goal would be for this project to result in the development and implementation of additional policies and incentives to reduce tree cover loss, and ultimately to reduce the rate of tree cover loss in the watershed.
Task Rationale	This was a project originally proposed for GIT funding that remains a high priority for the Forestry Workgroup and aligns closely with the B25 recommendations to elevate conservation as a key pillar of the Program.
Related Outcome	• Habitat GIT: By slowing the rate of tree cover loss in riparian areas and communities, this project would benefit multiple outcomes including Brook Trout and Stream Health. • Healthy Watersheds: By working to reduce the loss of tree cover in healthy watersheds, the project would support the maintenance of watershed health. • Stewardship: By identifying opportunities to increase conservation, the project would benefit the Protected Lands outcome. • Enhance Partnering, Leadership and Management: By working with local leaders to develop products that will be readily usable, the project would support the local leadership outcome.
Task Outcome/ "End" User	State and local government planners, policy-makers and decision-makers. The need for models and best practices for effective incentive-based and regulatory approaches to protect urban tree canopy emerged as a key priority from the watershed-wide Tree Canopy Funding and Policy roundtable in 2023 that engaged these identified end-users.
Assignment (Objective)	The project would evaluate existing policies and incentive programs used to reduce forest buffer and tree canopy loss. It would also identify best practices and model policies and easement programs that could be replicated. These models and best practices would address approaches for reducing tree cover loss both to more traditional development as well as emerging challenges, including the rapid growth of utility-scale solar installations and data warehouses. For forest buffers, the project would further evaluate the potential to develop a Bay-wide Buffer Easement Program. We would work with the Local Government Advisory Committee, the Local Leadership Workgroup and the Strategic Engagement Team to get input from a broader suite of people to help determine the best format for the final deliverables. We want to deliver information on incentive-based and regulatory approaches to protect riparian forest buffers and urban tree canopy in a format that would be readily usable. This may require developing more tailored products for particular states that reflect different policy contexts.

MB Champion:	Katie Brownson, USFS
Coordination Requirements (MB check-in frequency)	Annually or more frequent dependent on MB involvement.
Delivery Date (Month or Quarter / Year)	Dependent on capacity dedicated to this effort.
CBPO Support	SET, LGAC and local leadership support to evaluate how best to communicate models and best practices to target end users. Contractor or other dedicated staff support in completing the full scope of work would greatly increase likelihood of project completion.

[Back to top]

Developing a trees & climate resilience strategy guide for local governments

Task Name	Developing a trees & climate resilience strategy guide for local governments
Group Assigned	Forestry Workgroup
Task Description	This project would identify approaches for integrating both urban tree canopy and riparian forest buffers for climate resilience into comprehensive plans and other local plans. The goal would be for this project to result in the integration of trees for climate resilience into local planning documents and ultimately increase the pace and impact of tree canopy restoration and conservation in the watershed.
Task Rationale	This project would support multiple B25 recommendations, including the recommendations around using climate change projections to inform strategic planning at the local level, to enhance the local benefits of the Program's work by improving alignment with local plans and priorities, and enhancing technical assistance through local networks. The Tree Canopy Funding & Policy Roundtable also identified a need to provide guidance for local governments on how to integrate trees for climate resilience into comprehensive plans (and other local plans) with specific goals, and how to include climate resilience strategies in urban forest plans and projects. At the same time, the Rising Water Temperatures STAC report highlighted the critical role forest buffers play in moderating rising water temperatures and increasing climate resilience for aquatic ecosystems.
Related Outcome	Forest Buffers, Tree Canopy, Stream Health, Brook Trout, Climate Resilience, Land Use Methods and Metrics, Land Use Options Evaluation,
Task Outcome/ "End" User	Local planners and policy makers
Assignment (Objective)	The project will synthesize multiple recent or ongoing efforts in this area, including a current GIT funding project on optimizing RFB implementation for climate adaptation and resilience. Key tasks would include pulling together the latest tools from the Northern Institute for Applied Climate Science (NIACS) and other partners, as well as other resources and real-world

	examples of localities that have integrated trees for climate resilience into local plans. These materials would be packaged together into a "trees for climate resilience" guide for local governments. Information on approaches for integrating urban tree canopy and riparian forest buffers for climate resilience into local planning documents in a format that would be readily usable. This may require developing more tailored products for particular states that reflect different policy contexts.
MB Champion:	Katie Brownson, USFS
Coordination Requirements (MB check-in frequency)	Annually or more frequent dependent on MB involvement.
Delivery Date (Month or Quarter / Year)	Dependent on capacity dedicated to this effort.
CBPO Support	SET, LGAC and local leadership support to evaluate how best to package project deliverables to target end users. Contractor or other dedicated staff support in completing the full scope of work would greatly increase likelihood of project completion.

[Back to top]

Toxic Contaminants: Research or Policy & Prevention

Guidance on Selecting PFAS Analytical Approaches

Task Name	Guidance on Selecting PFAS Analytical Approaches
Group Assigned	Will be a goal team or multiple goal teams
Task Description	Clear description of tasks
Task Rationale	Why are we doing this, where did it originate
Related Outcome	Outcome or outcomes this activity will help achieve. If the activity is not linked to a specific outcome or set of outcomes, indicate the topical or focus area to which it applies (for example, "Governance and Management Framework" could apply to actions that address partnership structure, operations, and management).
Task Outcome/ "End" User	Who uses this and who will it affect
Assignment (Objective)	Concisely lay out the step(s)/deliverables that are expected from the assignment
MB Champion:	Management Board member who will assist and help guide the assignment to completion. Suggest that this not be the goal team leaders or advisory committees.
Coordination Requirements	How frequently do people check in with the Management Board, and what is expected during a check-in

(MB check-in frequency)	
Delivery Date (Month or Quarter / Year)	Listing of deliverables and due dates. These may be longer term activities that extend beyond the B25 phase 2 charge
CBPO Support	What entities are needed for support to make this successful

[Back to top]

Investigating the Presence of 6PPD/Q in Brook Trout Habitat

Task Name	Investigating the Presence of 6PPD/Q in Brook Trout Habitat
Group Assigned	Will be a goal team or multiple goal teams
Task Description	Clear description of tasks
Task Rationale	Why are we doing this, where did it originate
Related Outcome	Outcome or outcomes this activity will help achieve. If the activity is not linked to a specific outcome or set of outcomes, indicate the topical or focus area to which it applies (for example, "Governance and Management Framework" could apply to actions that address partnership structure, operations, and management).
Task Outcome/ "End" User	Who uses this and who will it affect
Assignment (Objective)	Concisely lay out the step(s)/deliverables that are expected from the assignment
MB Champion:	Management Board member who will assist and help guide the assignment to completion. Suggest that this not be the goal team leaders or advisory committees.
Coordination Requirements (MB check-in frequency)	How frequently do people check in with the Management Board, and what is expected during a check-in
Delivery Date (Month or Quarter / Year)	Listing of deliverables and due dates. These may be longer term activities that extend beyond the B25 phase 2 charge
CBPO Support	What entities are needed for support to make this successful

[Back to top]

Water Quality Outcomes: WQSAM or WIP

Incorporating WQ Monitoring Data into EPA and Partnerships evaluation of Progress

Task Name	**Incorporating WQ Monitoring Data into EPA and Partnerships evaluation of Progress**
Group Assigned	WQGIT/WQGIT workgroups
Task Description	Investigate and develop methods to incorporate WQ monitoring data into the EPA and Partnership evaluations of progress toward meeting TMDL objectives
Task Rationale	The Partnership's many active participants have collectively identified the importance of monitoring data in our programs. Currently EPA assesses annual progress of the WIP outcome based primarily on modeled load reductions. There are many reasons for this, however, the Partnership has expressly asked for the increased use of monitoring data to be used to evaluate progress and for other decision making. We have created a new TMDL indicator and an associated tool METRIC to assist the partnership in looking at both modeling and monitoring data. This is a good starting point in evaluating/determining how and if monitoring data can be given a greater priority in our assessments of annual and long term progress.
Related Outcome	Overall Partnership, implementors of WIPs/milestones, BMP reporters

Task Outcome/ "End" User	• Strategize and develop new ways to utilize the vast array of Partnership monitoring data to inform progress toward meeting water quality outcomes
	• Consider how the METRIC tool can be incorporated into progress evaluations at all timesteps and scales
	  ○ Look at the options for representing data from the METRIC tool and loading magnitude in addition to percentage reductions
	  ○ Evaluate stations where the modeled and monitored loads have the greatest disparity
	  ○ Evaluate using station data as a 10 year look-in for priority areas identified by METRIC
	  ○ Use the difference between lagged effort and the NTN data to identify areas of concern or focus points
	• Evaluate and prepare recommendations for presenting additional ways to focus our progress reviews on monitoring as well as modeling

Assignment (Objective)	
MB Champion:	Quarterly check-in with MB on progress
Coordination Requirements (MB check-in frequency)	August 1, 2025 – Present suite of recommended options for inclusion of Monitoring data into evaluations March 2026 – Present draft options for inclusion of Monitoring data into evaluations January 1, 2027 - Present final recommendations for inclusion of Monitoring data into evaluations
Delivery Date (Month or Quarter / Year)	Monitoring Team, GIS Team
CBPO Support	WQGIT/WQGIT workgroups

[Back to top]

Evaluation of annual Progress in Near Team Post-2025 period (2026 – 202_)[1]

Task Name	**Evaluation of annual Progress in Near Team Post-2025 period (2026 – 202_)**
Group Assigned	WQGIT
Task Description	Develop and provide alternatives for making comparison toward goal evaluations/calculations for the annual progress analysis for the period of 2026 through the start of use of the Phase 7 model.
Task Rationale	The Partnership has had a clear understanding of how they would be evaluated in terms of meeting annual nutrient and sediment reduction goals since the introduction of the TMDL in 2010. It has bee a straight line trajectory from 2010-2025 with an expected load reduction made each year to go from 0% in 2010 to 100% in 2025. Post 2025, there is no comparison method that has been agreed to by the Partnership. To provide consistent future comparison toward goals a new comparison marker would need to be utilized
Related Outcome	
Task Outcome/ "End" User	Overall Partnership, Developers and implementors of WIPs/milestones
Assignment (Objective)	• Develop plan/alternatives for annual progress comparison goals for the period 2026 through implementation of new planning targets using the Phase 7 model • Report progress to MB every 3 months • Have recommendation for the MB by September 2025
MB Champion:	
Coordination Requirements (MB check-in frequency)	Quarterly check-in with MB on progress –
Delivery Date (Month or Quarter / Year)	May 2025 - Draft recommendation to MB September 2025 – Final Recommendation to MB
CBPO Support	Implementation and Evaluation Team

[Back to top]

BMP Verification – Remote Sensing

Task Name	**BMP Verification – Remote Sensing**
Group Assigned	WQGIT/WQGIT workgroups
Task Description	Develop methods to remotely sense as many BMPs as possible. Utilize remote sensing as the primary mechanism for all BMPs in the list above so that future re-verification is completed by remote sensing.
Task Rationale	The Partnership has struggled with BMP verification and reporting information for evaluation of annual progress. Problems occurred with overreporting of BMP implementation which led to creation of the Partnership BMP verification framework, which has been deemed incredibly onerous by many partners. In addition, we have numerous issues with privacy laws regarding the protection of agricultural BMP information. Technology has improved to the point that through the use of new satellite data and machine learning methods that we should be able to reliably count BMPs through this. The Partnership as a whole could save time, effort and energy that could be invested technical assistance relationship building.
Related Outcome	
Task Outcome/ "End" User	Overall Partnership, implementors of WIPs/milestones, BMP reporters
Assignment (Objective)	• Develop a list of BMPs that may be able to be verified utilizing remote sensing • Develop alternatives for BMP verification into the future utilizing remote sensing and machine learning methods • Develop rules for verification of remotely sensed BMPs • Consider setting the landscape at a point in time and measuring forward (establishing a baseline condition of "now") • Consider the growth cycle for some BMPs (example: forest buffers) in the recommendations
MB Champion:	
Coordination Requirements (MB check-in frequency)	Quarterly check-in with MB on progress –
Delivery Date (Month or Quarter / Year)	January 1 2027 – Draft Recommendation on deployment of remote sensing for BMP verification July 1, 2027 - final recommendations on deployment of remote sensing for BMP verification
CBPO Support	Implementation and Evaluation Team, GIS Team

[Back to top]

Future Planning Efforts – WIPs/Milestones

Task Name	**Future Planning Efforts – WIPs/Milestones**
Group Assigned	WQGIT/WQGIT workgroups
Task Description	Develop timeline and strategy for development of next planning effort (WIP) and frequency and content of interim check-in on plan achievement (Milestones).
Task Rationale	The Partnership is poised to make many decisions on operation into the future. One of the cornerstone activities has been development of plans (WIPs) to outline how partners will meet their water quality goals, and the subsequent development of short term strategies to meet those goals Milestones. Many partners have identified that the milestone development/review process has not had the intended effect increasing implementation. There is an opportunity to shape the future of planning efforts and effect how our tracking and reporting of that progress and interim steps can be refined. The partnership can evaluate and determine the best path forward for future planning and reporting activities.
Related Outcome	
Task Outcome/ "End" User	Overall Partnership, implementors of WIPs/milestones,
Assignment (Objective)	• Develop methods/alternatives/option for planning to address increased effort needed to meet WQS that include 2035 climate change • Evaluate the impact/develop framework for how this planning effort can incorporate tiered implementation targets • Consider how to use multiple lines of evidence for evaluation and reporting of progress on meeting defined goals and objectives • Based on feedback from 2026-202? Milestone process, develop plan for future milestones ○ Consider frequency and evaluation timelines for milestones • Consider options an alternative to spur innovation in meeting goals and objectives • Consider the model update schedule as part of this recommendation
MB Champion:	
Coordination Requirements (MB check-in frequency)	Quarterly check-in with MB on progress –
Delivery Date (Month or Quarter / Year)	January 1, 2026 – Draft Recommendation on next planning effort July 1, 2026 - final recommendations on next planning effort
CBPO Support	Implementation and Evaluation Team

[Back to top]

Model Update Schedule – Phase Change/Data Updates

Task Name	**Model Update Schedule – Phase Change/Data Updates**
Group Assigned	WQGIT/Modeling Workgroup
Task Description	Develop and provide alternatives for future model updates that include recommended timeframes for Phase changes as well as data updates.
Task Rationale	The Partnership has struggled to make data updates to the CAST model. The current schedule for making data updates to the CAST model is every 2 years. There was so much disagreement on CAST21 that it was never released. There was considerable discussion throughout the Partnership on changing the frequency of data updates. There currently is no plan for the frequency of when Phase changes (opportunity to incorporate what we have learned and recalibrate our models) occur. The Partnership would be well served to have a clear schedule for model updates and that would allow for better resource planning for all Partners.
Related Outcome	
Task Outcome/ "End" User	Who uses this and who will it affect
Assignment (Objective)	Overall Partnership, Developers and implementors of WIPs/milestones

MB Champion:	• Develop multiple options/schedules that could be used to dictate future model updates
	• Consider the frequency of model updates
	• Consider the frequency/availability of important data set used in the models
	  ○ Should consider partner provided/program developed/national datasets
	• Consider effort to both develop and review new models
	  ○ Consider/evaluate the date update model review schedule developed by the watershed technical workgroup to deal with illogical results
	• Consider both data updates and phase changes in any new proposed schedule
	• Consider milestone update frequency in final recommendation

Coordination Requirements (MB check-in frequency)	
Delivery Date (Month or Quarter / Year)	Quarterly check-in with MB on progress –
CBPO Support	January 1 2027 – draft construct of what the future of model update will be July 1, 2027 – final recommendation on model update schedule

[Back to top]

Tiered Implementation Targets

Task Name	**Tiered Implementation Targets**
Group Assigned	WQGIT/Modeling Workgroup
Task Description	Develop methods to employ tiered implementation targets for future Partnership planning, restoration, and conservation activities
Task Rationale	Recommendations from the CESR report and clean water small group recognize the value of pursuing planning restoration and conservation activities that will meet local objectives to restore improve local conditions for living resources in shallow waters of the Bay in addition to continued effort to meet the objectives of deep water/deep channel in the Bay TMDL.
Related Outcome	
Task Outcome/ "End" User	Overall Partnership, Developers and implementors of WIPs/milestones
Assignment (Objective)	• Develop alternatives to implement a system of tiered implementation targets • Develop methods to incorporate methods to incorporate dual/multiple implementation targets into WIPs/milestones. ○ Methods should be based on evaluation results from all 92 Bay segments for D.O. Criteria; Priority Living resource habitat area scoring; SAV habitat area scoring • Develop an interactive geographic area-based analysis that demonstrates where work on the landscape will have the most effect in the tidal bay (looking downstream) • Develop an interactive geographic area-based analysis that shows what upland areas have the most significant impact on a portion of the tidal bay (looking upstream) • Incorporate the findings of the priority living resource habitat areas into a tool that assists resource managers with decision making. • Incorporate findings SAV habitat scoring that assists resource managers areas with decision making. • Develop boundary conditions that will insure that Deep Water Deep Channel D.O. Levels will not cause baywide harm
MB Champion:	
Coordination Requirements (MB check-in frequency)	Quarterly check-in with MB on progress – includes presentation on methods pursued/project viability and project needs • Should be reported on with Priority Living Resource Habitat Areas Should be reported on with Priority Living Resource Scoring Matrix
Delivery Date (Month or Quarter / Year)	January 1 2026 – draft construct of how tiered targeting can be employed January 1 2027 – Framework for tiered targeting completed
CBPO Support	GIS Team, Modeling Team

[Back to top]

NPS incentivization-tracking-communicating

Task Name	**NPS incentivization-tracking-communicating**
Group Assigned	WQGIT/WQGIT workgroups
Task Description	Investigate methods to incentivize Non-point source (NPS) pollution reductions, track and highlight innovation, and develop communication materials that display all activity initiated since the TMDL or Mid-point assessment.
Task Rationale	The Partnership's many active participants have collectively identified the need to address and focus our restoration activities on the mitigation of non-point source pollution. This is a known issue in the partnership, and it has been suggested through multiple entities that we need to attach this known issue in a focused manner. We have heard from many partners that they would like space and opportunity for experimentation and innovation in how we pursue NPS mitigation. It is also important that we have the ability as a Partnership to communicate the great work and new programs that have been put in place in recent years. Individual partners do a great job at communicating their efforts, however, there not been a concerted effort to put together a communications package for the overall Partnership on NPS mitigation activities.
Related Outcome	
Task Outcome/ "End" User	Overall Partnership, implementors of WIPs/milestones, BMP reporters

Assignment (Objective)	• Strategize and develop new/innovative options for scaling up and incentivizing NPS pollution mitigation
	  ○ Consider how this innovation can be considered and incorporated into milestones
	  ○ Consider how innovation and incentives can be measured and accounted for
	• Develop options for gathering information on NPS mitigation activities (new programs, new funding, scaled up implementation effort) from jurisdictional partners to highlight activities occurring throughout the watershed

MB Champion:	
Coordination Requirements (MB check-in frequency)	Quarterly check-in with MB on progress
Delivery Date (Month or Quarter / Year)	April 1, 2025 – Develop plan to gather and communicate new programs and activities regarding NPS pollution mitigation August 1, 2025 – Roll out communication on January 1 2026 – Draft Recommendation on incentivization/innovation January 1, 2027 - final recommendations on incentivization/innovation
CBPO Support	Communications Team, Implementation and Evaluation Team, GIS Team

[Back to top]

Phase 7 Model[1]

Task Name	Phase 7 Model
Group Assigned	STAR/Modeling Workgroup/WQGIT
Task Description	Develop the next suite of CBP models to be (Phase 7) used by the partnership to inform decisions related to nutrient and sediment reduction goals outlined in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement. Integral to this updated suite of tools is the ability to project climate change effect through 2035.
Task Rationale	The partnership is constantly learning new things about the watershed, airshed and the estuarine models. Periodically, based on new scientific findings and new questions asked by the Partnership, the Partnership has pursued an update to the suite of models. The models represent the collective learning of the Bay Program and help us plan better ways to meet the new challenges we encounter. One of the more pronounced challenges is the effect of climate change. We are well underway with the update to the suite of models. The intention for this assignment is to keep this critically important piece of the Bay Program focused in our sights.
Related Outcome	
Task Outcome/ "End" User	Overall Partnership, Developers/implementors of WIPs/milestones
Assignment (Objective)	Develop the next iteration of the Chesapeake Bay suit of models. Model development has been broken into 8 distinct pieces. Adhere to the schedule that has been approved by the WQGIT/MB/PSC. The criteria assessment piece is being given its own assignment as the 4D interpolator. 1. High Resolution Land Use 2. Chesapeake Assessment Scenario Tool (CAST) 3. Optimization 4. Agricultural Inputs 5. Atmospheric Deposition Modeling 6. Watershed Modeling 7. Estuarine Modeling 8. Criteria Assessment
MB Champion:	
Coordination Requirements (MB check-in frequency)	Quarterly check-in with MB on progress –
Delivery Date (Month or Quarter / Year)	January 1, 2026 – Phase 7 Suite of models ready for review January 1, 2027 – Deploy Phase 7 suite of models for use in generating scenarios for planning January 1, 2028 – Phase 7 models fully operational for Partnership Use
CBPO Support	Modeling Team, Monitoring Team, Implementation and evaluation Team, GIS Team, Data Center Team

[Back to top]

4D Interpolator[1]

Task Name	**4D Interpolator**
Group Assigned	STAR/Integrated Monitoring Network Team/Bay Oxygen Research Group (BORG)
Task Description	Develop a new tool that will allow integration of multiple datasets of varying spatial and temporal scales to provide interpolation of water quality data (dissolved oxygen) across the tidal bay.
Task Rationale	The Partnership cannot currently assess all 92 segments of the Chesapeake Bay for all of its dissolved oxygen criteria. The current method of assessment relies on a tool that was developed over 30 years ago to determine attainment with water quality standards and can only assess the longer term 30 day mean dissolved oxygen criteria. There are shorter duration criteria, instantaneous minimum, 1-day mean, 7 day mean that are crucial to living resources and their habitat areas. This tool will allow for assessment of all of those dissolved oxygen criteria which will provide insight into the recommendations from the CESR report to focus on living resource outcomes and not load reductions.
Related Outcome	
Task Outcome/ "End" User	Overall Partnership, implementors of WIPs/milestones, Assessors of WQ criteria

Assignment (Objective)	• develop a new water quality interpolation tool to generate DO estimates across space and through time, improving upon the current spatial interpolation used in the Chesapeake Bay. The output of the tool will allow for expanded evaluation of short-duration criteria (i.e., instantaneous minimum, 1-day mean, 7 day mean) and aid in habitat assessments.
	• Consider and incorporate data from multiple spatial and temporal scales into the tool
	  ○ Utilize continuous monitoring data
	  ○ Utilize new data from vertical arrays
	  ○ Utilize data traditional cruises
	  ○ Utilize data collected by community scientists
	  ○ Anticipate that new data sources may become available and have plan for incorporation
	• Consider the new grid utilized for P7 estuarine model when developing the 4D interpolator
	• Develop communication materials to explain how the tool operates

MB Champion:	
Coordination Requirements (MB check-in frequency)	Quarterly check-in with MB on progress –
Delivery Date (Month or Quarter / Year)	January 1, 2026 – Detailed presentation on interpolator and methods January 1, 2027 – Draft Interpolator completed for Partnership Review January 1, 2028 – 4D interpolator Complete
CBPO Support	Implementation and Evaluation Team

[Back to top]

Monitoring Network – Funding the Future[1]

Task Name	**Monitoring Network – Funding the Future**
Group Assigned	STAR/Integrated Monitoring Team
Task Description	Develop strategy/recommendations for funding the CBP core monitoring networks into the future
Task Rationale	The Chesapeake Bay Program (CBP) partners invest heavily in monitoring networks across the watershed because high-quality monitoring data are critical for status and trend assessments, tracking progress towards shared restoration goals, and informing modeling efforts. Recent efforts like the "Enhancing the Chesapeake Bay Program Monitoring Networks" Report (link) have documented the state of the monitoring networks to include both priority needs for enhancement, as well as areas where inflationary pressures have stressed the network to a breaking point. Fortunately, funding from the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law provided to EPA were used to support over 90% of the recommendations for network investment. However, Infrastructure Law funding will only support the network through 2026, and new resources will be needed thereafter to support the networks and prevent a significant contraction. We need to explore what is needed to sustain our networks and show what will be missed additional funding is not available.
Related Outcome	
Task Outcome/ "End" User	Overall Partnership, Developers/implementors of WIPs/milestones
Assignment (Objective)	Develop a set of strategies/recommendations that partners can use to advocate within their respective agencies for funding of the core monitoring networks. Strategy should address/consider the following: • Understanding the existing monitoring networks within the CBP partnership • Capture and articulate the critical role each of them serves in the CBP partnership • Capture the scale of the potential 2026 contraction when the Infrastructure support finishes • Identify alternate funding opportunities to support these monitoring networks beyond 2026 through increased collaboration between federal, state, academic and local monitoring programs
MB Champion:	
Coordination Requirements (MB check-in frequency)	Semi-annual updates to the MB and PSC
Delivery Date (Month or Quarter / Year)	January 1, 2025 – Updates to the MB and PSC July 1, 2025 – Updates to the MB and PSC January 1, 2026 – final recommendations/strategy to MB and PSC
CBPO Support	Monitoring Team

[Back to top]

Geographic Targeting for BMP Implementation

Task Name	**Geographic Targeting for BMP Implementation**
Group Assigned	STAR
Task Description	Develop and enhance targeting tools and integrate the BMP optimization into those tools
Task Rationale	The Partnership is currently evaluating ways to focus on living resources and shallow water habitats in addition to the current focus of meeting the deep water/deep channel water quality criteria. This is a new look at how the Partnership goes about their work. The Partnership has invested in determining the best places to implement BMPs based throughout the watershed to have the greatest impact on deep water dissolved oxygen. There have also been investments in wide scale optimization for BMP implementation. These efforts need to be combined with the work of the GIS Team targeting portal to bring forward the best information we can to support water quality restoration efforts.
Related Outcome	
Task Outcome/ "End" User	Overall Partnership, WIP/Milestone Developers, Resource managers, Implementers of BMPs

Assignment (Objective)	• Enhance the targeting portal and marry up the optimization work that was done by Michigan State University
	• Develop data visualization aids for targeting BMP implementation
	  ○ Work with Fisheries team to develop visualization tools for aid in understanding living resource/shallow water habitat endpoints
	  ○ Work with the modeling team to integrate the BMP optimization routines to aid targeting efforts

MB Champion:	VA/MD/DC should have oversight
Coordination Requirements (MB check-in frequency)	Semi-annual check-ins with MB
Delivery Date (Month or Quarter / Year)	• January 1, 2026 – present draft targeting tools to MB January 1, 2027 - Complete BMP targeting package
CBPO Support	GIS Team, Modeling Team

[Back to top]

Placeholder for understanding impact of, and options to address, growth and nutrient imbalances

Task Name	Not too long, but descriptive
Group Assigned	Will be a goal team or multiple goal teams
Task Description	Clear description of tasks
Task Rationale	Why are we doing this, where did it originate
Related Outcome	Outcome or outcomes this activity will help achieve. If the activity is not linked to a specific outcome or set of outcomes, indicate the topical or focus area to which it applies (for example, "Governance and Management Framework" could apply to actions that address partnership structure, operations, and management).
Task Outcome/ "End" User	Who uses this and who will it affect
Assignment (Objective)	Concisely lay out the step(s)/deliverables that are expected from the assignment
MB Champion:	Management Board member who will assist and help guide the assignment to completion. Suggest that this not be the goal team leaders or advisory committees.
Coordination Requirements (MB check-in frequency)	How frequently do people check in with the Management Board, and what is expected during a check-in
Delivery Date (Month or Quarter / Year)	Listing of deliverables and due dates. These may be longer term activities that extend beyond the B25 phase 2 charge
CBPO Support	What entities are needed for support to make this successful

[Back to top]

Improve the understanding of connectivity and habitat function under changing conditions by expanding Chesapeake Bay and watershed monitoring and modeling to include shallow water habitats.

Task Name	Improve the understanding of connectivity and habitat function under changing conditions by expanding Chesapeake Bay and watershed monitoring and modeling to include shallow water habitats.
Group Assigned	STAR/Modeling/Monitoring
Task Description	See below
Task Rationale	Originated in a recommendation from the Shallow Waters small group of B25 Phase 1
Related Outcome	WQSAM
Task Outcome/ "End" User	Monitoring/modeling team
Assignment (Objective)	-compile evaluation based on the following -how could wq monitoring data be used -incorporation of LR + ecosystem services -progress reporting -METRIC
MB Champion:	
Coordination Requirements (MB check-in frequency)	Infrequent
Delivery Date (Month or Quarter / Year)	Deliverables would be an evaluation of how monitoring data could be used in the process, how living resources + ecosystem services could be connected to WQ, how progress reporting could be leveraged, how METRIC could be used, and recommendation on revising policies and guidance.
CBPO Support	STAR/Modeling/Monitoring team

[Back to top]