

## Chesapeake Bay Program Management Board Meeting – March 27th, 2025

### Outcome Review Meeting Pulse Checks

The Pulse Check is a tool that will be used during the Outcome Review Meetings to record the informal Outcome disposition (consolidate, reclassify, remove, replace, update, or stand aside) preferences of Management Board (MB) members. All Management Board members (voting and non-voting) are invited to participate in the Pulse Check.

This Pulse Check is not a consensus continuum. Rather, it is an informal tool for MB members to express their sentiment for a given Outcome. It is expected that some preferences will change as meetings and discussions progress. The Pulse Check is not anonymous; this will allow for discussions between parties with differing preferences to take place between Outcome Review Meetings

Pulse Checks will be completed during the Outcome Review Meetings on February 13, February 27, and March 13. A Pulse Check will be completed on March 21<sup>st</sup> to inform the March 27th consensus meeting for getting to final dispositions.

This Pulse Check was downloaded on March 25, 2025.

Possible Outcome Dispositions	
<b>Select Disposition</b>	Response to Pulse Check has not yet been recorded
<b>Consolidate</b>	(i.e., Combine) Multiple Outcomes would be combined in a single Outcome, or activities contributing to an Outcome are dispersed across others
<b>Reclassify</b>	Outcome is changed to an output, or a different structure is adopted.
<b>Remove</b>	The Outcome is removed from the 2014 Agreement.
<b>Replace</b>	This language suggests that a novel Outcome replaces a current one and that it relates in its intent or subject area.
<b>Update</b>	Outcome intent is largely kept intact. Unique language may be necessary if it is more than just a SMART update. Key principle is maintaining the intent.
<b>Stand-Aside</b>	I am not registering agreement or disagreement, but consciously determining not to influence the decision.

## Pulse Check Summary by Outcome

SUSTAINABLE SCHOOLS					
Org	Outcome	GIT Recommendation	Outcome Disposition	Rationale for Outcome Disposition	Follow-Up Questions
DC	Sustainable Schools	Reclassify	Reclassify	DC supports the GIT's disposition.	
DE	Sustainable Schools	Reclassify	Reclassify	DE agrees with recommendation.	
MD	Sustainable Schools	Reclassify	Reclassify	Agree with the recommendation.	
NY	Sustainable Schools	Reclassify	Stand-Aside	NY has statewide environmental education programs but does not currently participate in this outcome	
PA	Sustainable Schools	Reclassify	Reclassify	Agree to Reclassify.	
VA	Sustainable Schools	Reclassify	Reclassify	Agree with the GIT's recommendation that the Partnership is not well positioned to add value in this area.	
WV	Sustainable Schools	Reclassify	Stand-Aside		

CBC	Sustainable Schools	Reclassify	Reclassify	Reclassify as an indicator for use by the environmental literacy planning outcome	
EPA	Sustainable Schools	Reclassify	Reclassify	EPA supports the GIT's recommendation.	
DOD	Sustainable Schools	Reclassify	Stand-Aside		
DHS	Sustainable Schools	Reclassify	Select Disposition		
DOT	Sustainable Schools	Reclassify	Select Disposition		
NRCS	Sustainable Schools	Reclassify	Stand-Aside		
USFS	Sustainable Schools	Reclassify	Stand-Aside		
ACE	Sustainable Schools	Reclassify	Stand-Aside		
NOAA	Sustainable Schools	Reclassify	Reclassify		
FWS	Sustainable Schools	Reclassify	Reclassify	We defer to the technical experts in the Workgroup	NA
NPS	Sustainable Schools	Reclassify	Stand-Aside	NPS supports the recommendation to reclassify, however the agency is not signed on to	

				this outcome directly, so we stand aside.	
USGS	Sustainable Schools	Reclassify	Reclassify		
GIT 1	Sustainable Schools	Reclassify	Stand-Aside		
GIT 2	Sustainable Schools	Reclassify	Reclassify		
GIT 3	Sustainable Schools	Reclassify	Reclassify	Agree with GIT recommendation - leads to future environmental leaders	
GIT 4	Sustainable Schools	Reclassify	Reclassify	Agree with GIT recommendation	
GIT 5	Sustainable Schools	Reclassify	Reclassify		
GIT 6	Sustainable Schools	Reclassify	Reclassify		
STAR	Sustainable Schools	Reclassify	Reclassify		
LGAC	Sustainable Schools	Reclassify	Reclassify		
SAC	Sustainable Schools	Reclassify	Reclassify	agree with recommendation to	n/a

				reclassify. Keep tracking the data!	
STAC	Sustainable Schools	Reclassify	Reclassify		

SUSTAINABLE SCHOOLS - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference				
Outcome Disposition	Count (total)	Average (total)	Count (voting)	Count (non-voting)
Consolidate	0	0.00%	0	0
Reclassify	19	65.52%	7	12
Remove	0	0.00%	0	0
Replace	0	0.00%	0	0
Update	0	0.00%	0	0
Stand-Aside	8	27.59%	2	6
Select Disposition	2	6.90%	0	2
SUM	29	100.00%	9	20

## SUSTAINABLE SCHOOLS - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference (Percentage)

Select Disposition


6.9%

Stand-Aside


27.6%

Reclassify

65.5%



## SUSTAINABLE SCHOOLS Disposition Preference - Voting & Non-Voting Members



Environmental Literacy Planning					
Org	Outcome (Instruction)	GIT Recommendation	Outcome Disposition	Rationale for Outcome Disposition	Follow-Up Questions
DC	Environmental Literacy Planning	Update	Update	DC supports the GIT's disposition.	
DE	Environmental Literacy Planning	Update	Update	DE agrees with recommendation.	
MD	Environmental Literacy Planning	Update	Update	Agree with the recommendation.	
NY	Environmental Literacy Planning	Update	Stand-Aside	NY has statewide environmental education programs but does not currently participate in this outcome	
PA	Environmental Literacy Planning	Update	Update	Agree to Update.	
VA	Environmental Literacy Planning	Update	Update	Agree that there is value to Bay wide collaboration and coordination in this space. Would like to see the outcome metric based on a percentage increase over where we are currently, versus a flat increase.	
WV	Environmental Literacy Planning	Update	Stand-Aside		
CBC	Environmental Literacy Planning	Update	Update	Agree with the recommendation	
EPA	Environmental Literacy Planning	Update	Update	EPA supports the GIT's recommendation.	



DOD	Environmental Literacy Planning	<b>Update</b>	<b>Stand-Aside</b>		
DHS	Environmental Literacy Planning	<b>Update</b>	Select Disposition		
DOT	Environmental Literacy Planning	<b>Update</b>	Select Disposition		
NRCS	Environmental Literacy Planning	<b>Update</b>	<b>Stand-Aside</b>		
USFS	Environmental Literacy Planning	<b>Update</b>	<b>Stand-Aside</b>		
ACE	Environmental Literacy Planning	<b>Update</b>	<b>Stand-Aside</b>		
NOAA	Environmental Literacy Planning	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>		
FWS	Environmental Literacy Planning	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>	We defer to the technical experts in the WORKgroup	NA
NPS	Environmental Literacy Planning	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>		
USGS	Environmental Literacy Planning	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>		
GIT 1	Environmental Literacy Planning	<b>Update</b>	<b>Stand-Aside</b>		
GIT 2	Environmental Literacy Planning	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>		

GIT 3	Environmental Literacy Planning	Update	Update	Agree with GIT recommendation, and importance of this work in continuing to emphasize the importance of understanding environmental goals and needs. We need youth educated on environmental concerns and challenges so we can inform the current network of leaders and the next generation of environmental leaders.	
GIT 4	Environmental Literacy Planning	Update	Update	Agree with GIT recommendation	
GIT 5	Environmental Literacy Planning	Update	Update		
GIT 6	Environmental Literacy Planning	Update	Update		
STAR	Environmental Literacy Planning	Update	Update		
LGAC	Environmental Literacy Planning	Update	Update		
SAC	Environmental Literacy Planning	Update	Update	agree with update and support the value of ELit Planning	n/a
STAC	Environmental Literacy Planning	Update	Update		

ENVIRONMENTAL LITERACY PLANNING - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference				
Outcome Disposition	Count (total)	Average (total)	Count (voting)	Count (non-voting)
Consolidate	0	0.00%	0	0
Reclassify	0	0.00%	0	0
Remove	0	0.00%	0	0
Replace	0	0.00%	0	0
Update	20	68.97%	7	13
Stand-Aside	7	24.14%	2	5
Select Disposition	2	6.90%	0	2
SUM	29	100.00%	9	20

## ENVIRONMENTAL LITERACY PLANNING - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference (Percentage)

Select Disposition


6.9%

Stand-Aside


24.1%

Update

69.0%



## ENVIRONMENTAL LITERACY PLANNING Disposition Preference - Voting & Non-Voting Members




STUDENT					
Org	Outcome (Instruction)	GIT Recommendation	Outcome Disposition	Rationale for Outcome Disposition	Follow-Up Questions
DC	Student	Update	Update	DC supports the GIT's disposition.	
DE	Student	Update	Update	DE agrees with recommendation.	
MD	Student	Update	Update	Agree with the recommendation.	
NY	Student	Update	Stand-Aside	NY has statewide environmental education programs but does not currently participate in this outcome	
PA	Student	Update	Update	Agree to Update.	
VA	Student	Update	Update	Agree that there is value to Bay wide collaboration and coordination in this space. Would like to see the outcome metric based on a percentage increase over where we are currently, versus a flat increase.	
WV	Student	Update	Stand-Aside		
CBC	Student	Update	Update	Agree with the recommendation	
EPA	Student	Update	Update	EPA supports the GIT's recommendation.	
DOD	Student	Update	Stand-Aside		
DHS	Student	Update	Select Disposition		
DOT	Student	Update	Select Disposition		
NRCS	Student	Update	Stand-Aside		

USFS	Student	Update	Stand-Aside		
ACE	Student	Update	Stand-Aside		
NOAA	Student	Update	Update		
FWS	Student	Update	Update	We defer to the technical experts in the Workgroup	NA
NPS	Student	Update	Update		
USGS	Student	Update	Update		
GIT 1	Student	Update	Stand-Aside		
GIT 2	Student	Update	Update		
GIT 3	Student	Update	Update	Agree with GIT recommendation - leads to future environmental leaders	
GIT 4	Student	Update	Update	Agree with GIT recommendation	
GIT 5	Student	Update	Update		
GIT 6	Student	Update	Update		
STAR	Student	Update	Update		
LGAC	Student	Update	Update		
SAC	Student	Update	Update	agree with update, particularly including consideration of some informal partner activities for overall impact	n/a
STAC	Student	Update	Update		


STUDENT - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference				
Outcome Disposition	Count (total)	Average (total)	Count (voting)	Count (non-voting)
Consolidate	0	0.00%	0	0
Reclassify	0	0.00%	0	0
Remove	0	0.00%	0	0
Replace	0	0.00%	0	0
Update	20	68.97%	7	13
Stand-Aside	7	24.14%	2	5
Select Disposition	2	6.90%	0	2
SUM	29	100.00%	9	20



STUDENT - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference (Percentage)



## STUDENT Disposition Preference - Voting & Non-Voting Members




<b>DIVERSITY</b>					
<b>Org</b>	<b>Outcome (Instruction)</b>	<b>GIT Recommendation</b>	<b>Outcome Disposition</b>	<b>Rationale for Outcome Disposition</b>	<b>Follow-Up Questions</b>
DC	Diversity	Replace	Replace	DC supports the GIT's disposition.	
DE	Diversity	Replace	Replace	DE agrees with recommendation.	
MD	Diversity	Replace	Replace	Agree with the recommendation to replace with a new Workforce Outcome.	
NY	Diversity	Replace	Stand-Aside	Environmental workforce capacity, training, and retention is a need in NY. NY has statewide diversity and inclusion goals but has not participated on the diversity outcome/workgroup.	
PA	Diversity	Replace	Replace	Agree to Replace with Workforce, per recommendation	
VA	Diversity	Replace	Replace	The Bay is an economic driver, and collaboration across the partnership could increase this return for all, while fostering increased connection to the Bay for its people.	
WV	Diversity	Replace	Stand-Aside		
CBC	Diversity	Replace	Replace	Agree with the recommendation to pursue a Workforce outcome.	
EPA	Diversity	Replace	Replace	EPA supports the GIT's recommendation.	
DOD	Diversity	Replace	Stand-Aside		
DHS	Diversity	Replace	Select Disposition		
DOT	Diversity	Replace	Select Disposition		
NRCS	Diversity	Replace	Stand-Aside		

USFS	Diversity	Replace	Stand-Aside		
ACE	Diversity	Replace	Stand-Aside		
NOAA	Diversity	Replace	Replace		
FWS	Diversity	Replace	Replace	We defer to the technical experts in the Workgroup	NA
NPS	Diversity	Replace	Replace	NPS is no longer the lead or involved in Diversity work, per Fed EO; NPS supports the proposed Workforce replacement.	
USGS	Diversity	Replace	Replace		
GIT 1	Diversity	Replace	Stand-Aside		
GIT 2	Diversity	Replace	Replace		
GIT 3	Diversity	Replace	Replace	Agree with this recommendation to incorporate a new workforce outcome. The WQGIT has identified a limited workforce or workforce capacity as part of the ongoing challenge to meeting the WIP outcome. The WQGIT struggled with this challenge as many members are not in charge of staffing and workforce development. The WQGIT is happy to support this proposed outcome and hope this moves forward. A workforce outcome is an excellent example of how we can show that outcomes in the Bay agreement support multiple benefits to other outcomes. We're all connected.	
GIT 4	Diversity	Replace	Replace	Agree with GIT recommendation	
GIT 5	Diversity	Replace	Replace		
GIT 6	Diversity	Replace	Replace		
STAR	Diversity	Replace	Replace		


LGAC	Diversity	Replace	Replace		
SAC	Diversity	Replace	Replace	agree with replacement, have regularly included workforce and economic advice in annual reports	n/a
STAC	Diversity	Replace	Stand-Aside		

DIVERSITY - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference				
Outcome Disposition	Count (total)	Average (total)	Count (voting)	Count (non-voting)
Consolidate	0	0.00%	0	0
Reclassify	0	0.00%	0	0
Remove	0	0.00%	0	0
Replace	19	65.52%	7	12
Update	0	0.00%	0	0
Stand-Aside	8	27.59%	2	6
Select Disposition	2	6.90%	0	2
SUM	29	100.00%	9	20

## DIVERSITY - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference (Percentage)



## DIVERSITY Disposition Preference - Voting & Non-Voting Members



PUBLIC ACCESS SITE DEVELOPMENT					
Org	Outcome (Instruction)	GIT Recommendation	Outcome Disposition	Rationale for Outcome Disposition	Follow-Up Questions
DC	Public Access Site Development	Update	Update	DC supports the GIT's disposition.	
DE	Public Access Site Development	Update	Update	DE agrees with recommendation.	
MD	Public Access Site Development	Update	Update	Agree with the recommendation and support inclusion of land access sites in addition to water access sites.	
NY	Public Access Site Development	Update	Update	Agree with the recommendations	
PA	Public Access Site Development	Update	Update	Agree to Update. Support inclusion of land access	
VA	Public Access Site Development	Update	Update	The Program's work to understand user group experiences, motivations, and challenges contributes to the state's ability to thoughtfully allocate resources toward supporting constituent needs and interests. Support updating, but need to maintain the	



				straightforward simplicity of the current language.	
WV	Public Access Site Development	Update	Stand-Aside		
CBC	Public Access Site Development	Update	Update	Agree with the recommendation	
EPA	Public Access Site Development	Update	Update	EPA supports the GIT's recommendation.	
DOD	Public Access Site Development	Update	Update		
DHS	Public Access Site Development	Update	Select Disposition		
DOT	Public Access Site Development	Update	Select Disposition		
NRCS	Public Access Site Development	Update	Stand-Aside		
USFS	Public Access Site Development	Update	Update	Support the disposition of the workgroup and the expansion of	


				focus to look at public access to land	
ACE	Public Access Site Development	Update	Stand-Aside		
NOAA	Public Access Site Development	Update	Stand-Aside		
FWS	Public Access Site Development	Update	Update	We defer to the technical experts in the WOrkgroup	NA
NPS	Public Access Site Development	Update	Update		
USGS	Public Access Site Development	Update	Update		
GIT 1	Public Access Site Development	Update	Stand-Aside		
GIT 2	Public Access Site Development	Update	Update		
GIT 3	Public Access Site Development	Update	Stand-Aside	Support GIT recommendation and appreciate the importance of green spaces and natural systems in protecting water quality, but a stand	

				aside as the WQGIT doesn't attend these meetings.	
GIT 4	Public Access Site Development	Update	Update	Agree with GIT recommendation	Integrate Land Use Methods and Metrics outputs and information from the Land Use Decision Support outcome into the management strategy for this outcome.
GIT 5	Public Access Site Development	Update	Update		
GIT 6	Public Access Site Development	Update	Update		
STAR	Public Access Site Development	Update	Update		
LGAC	Public Access Site Development	Update	Update		
SAC	Public Access Site Development	Update	Update	agree with update to include land, interact with Protected Lands for efficiency	n/a


STAC	Public Access Site Development	Update	Update		
------	--------------------------------------	--------	--------	--	--

PUBLIC ACCESS SITE DEVELOPMENT - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference				
Outcome Disposition	Count (total)	Average (total)	Count (voting)	Count (non-voting)
Consolidate	0	0.00%	0	0
Reclassify	0	0.00%	0	0
Remove	0	0.00%	0	0
Replace	0	0.00%	0	0
Update	21	72.41%	8	13
Stand-Aside	6	20.69%	1	5
Select Disposition	2	6.90%	0	2
SUM	29	100.00%	9	20

## PUBLIC ACCESS SITE DEVELOPMENT - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference (Percentage)



## PUBLIC ACCESS Disposition Preference - Voting & Non-Voting Members



PROTECTED LANDS					
Org	Outcome (Instruction)	GIT Recommendation	Outcome Disposition	Rationale for Outcome Disposition	Follow-Up Questions
DC	Protected Lands	Update	Update	DC supports the GIT's disposition.	
DE	Protected Lands	Update	Update	DE agrees with recommendation.	
MD	Protected Lands	Update	Update	Agree with the recommendation.	
NY	Protected Lands	Update	Update	Agree with the recommendations	
PA	Protected Lands	Update	Update	Agree to Update. Support inclusion of agricultural/working lands.	
VA	Protected Lands	Update	Update	Agree there is value derived from the partnership in this space.	
WV	Protected Lands	Update	Stand-Aside		
CBC	Protected Lands	Update	Update	Agree with the recommendation	
EPA	Protected Lands	Update	Update	EPA supports the GIT's recommendation.	
DOD	Protected Lands	Update	Update		

DHS	Protected Lands	Update	Select Disposition		
DOT	Protected Lands	Update	Select Disposition		
NRCS	Protected Lands	Update	Stand-Aside		
USFS	Protected Lands	Update	Update	Support the disposition of the workgroup and the inclusion of sub-goals for forests and riparian forests	
ACE	Protected Lands	Update	Stand-Aside		
NOAA	Protected Lands	Update	Stand-Aside		
FWS	Protected Lands	Update	Update	We defer to the technical experts in the Workgroup	NA
NPS	Protected Lands	Update	Update		
USGS	Protected Lands	Update	Update		
GIT 1	Protected Lands	Update	Stand-Aside		
GIT 2	Protected Lands	Update	Update		



GIT 3	Protected Lands	Update	Update	Support this recommendation as these lands contribute to water quality improvements toward meeting the WIP outcome(s).	
GIT 4	Protected Lands	Update	Update	Agree with GIT recommendation	Integrate Healthy Watersheds and Land Use Methods and Metrics outputs into the management strategy for this outcome.
GIT 5	Protected Lands	Update	Update		
GIT 6	Protected Lands	Update	Update		
STAR	Protected Lands	Update	Update		
LGAC	Protected Lands	Update	Update		
SAC	Protected Lands	Update	Update	agree with update. Important to support Conservation as a new CBP pillar	n/a
STAC	Protected Lands	Update	Update		

PROTECTED LANDS - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference				
Outcome Disposition	Count (total)	Average (total)	Count (voting)	Count (non-voting)
Consolidate	0	0.00%	0	0
Reclassify	0	0.00%	0	0
Remove	0	0.00%	0	0
Replace	0	0.00%	0	0
Update	22	75.86%	8	14
Stand-Aside	5	17.24%	1	4
Select Disposition	2	6.90%	0	2
SUM	29	100.00%	9	20

## PROTECTED LANDS - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference (Percentage)

Select Disposition


6.9%

Stand-Aside


17.2%

Update

75.9%



## PROTECTED LANDS Disposition Preference - Voting & Non-Voting Members



SUBMERGED AQUATIC VEGETATION					
Org	Outcome (Instruction)	GIT Recommendation	Outcome Disposition	Rationale for Outcome Disposition	Follow-Up Questions
DC	Submerged Aquatic Vegetation	Update	Update	DC supports the GIT's disposition.	
DE	Submerged Aquatic Vegetation	Update	Stand-Aside	DE is not signed on for this outcome.	
MD	Submerged Aquatic Vegetation	Update	Update	Agree with the recommendation.	
NY	Submerged Aquatic Vegetation	Update	Stand-Aside	There are no SAV in NY's portion of the watershed	
PA	Submerged Aquatic Vegetation	Update	Stand-Aside	PA does not currently participate in this outcome.	
VA	Submerged Aquatic Vegetation	Update	Update	Agree with updating to align with jurisdictional SAV and water clarity standards.	
WV	Submerged Aquatic Vegetation	Update	Stand-Aside		

CBC	Submerged Aquatic Vegetation	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>	Agree with the recommendation	
EPA	Submerged Aquatic Vegetation	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>	EPA supports the GIT's recommendation.	
DOD	Submerged Aquatic Vegetation	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>		
DHS	Submerged Aquatic Vegetation	<b>Update</b>	Select Disposition		
DOT	Submerged Aquatic Vegetation	<b>Update</b>	Select Disposition		
NRCS	Submerged Aquatic Vegetation	<b>Update</b>	<b>Stand-Aside</b>		
USFS	Submerged Aquatic Vegetation	<b>Update</b>	<b>Stand-Aside</b>		
ACE	Submerged Aquatic Vegetation	<b>Update</b>	<b>Stand-Aside</b>		

NOAA	Submerged Aquatic Vegetation	Update	Update		
FWS	Submerged Aquatic Vegetation	Update	Update	We defer to the technical experts in the Workgroup	NA
NPS	Submerged Aquatic Vegetation	Update	Stand-Aside	NPS does not take a position on this outcome	
USGS	Submerged Aquatic Vegetation	Update	Update		
GIT 1	Submerged Aquatic Vegetation	Update	Stand-Aside	SAV is important fish habitat and we intend to work with SAV workgroup to incorporate SAV in tidal fish habitat assessment	
GIT 2	Submerged Aquatic Vegetation	Update	Update		
GIT 3	Submerged Aquatic Vegetation	Update	Update	Support the GIT recommendation. Agree with points made that SAV is an indicator of WQ and WQ is an indicator of SAV, but doesn't negate the need for both to remain an outcome. SAV helps make	

				that visual connection to improved water quality to protect living resources.	
GIT 4	Submerged Aquatic Vegetation	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>	Agree with GIT recommendation	
GIT 5	Submerged Aquatic Vegetation	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>		
GIT 6	Submerged Aquatic Vegetation	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>		
STAR	Submerged Aquatic Vegetation	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>		
LGAC	Submerged Aquatic Vegetation	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>		
SAC	Submerged Aquatic Vegetation	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>	while it can be an output/indicator of other outcomes, other outcomes can also be outputs/indicators of SAV	n/a
STAC	Submerged Aquatic Vegetation	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>		



SUBMERGED AQUATIC VEGETATION - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference				
Outcome Disposition	Count (total)	Average (total)	Count (voting)	Count (non-voting)
Consolidate	0	0.00%	0	0
Reclassify	0	0.00%	0	0
Remove	0	0.00%	0	0
Replace	0	0.00%	0	0
Update	18	62.07%	5	13
Stand-Aside	9	31.03%	4	5
Select Disposition	2	6.90%	0	2
SUM	29	100.00%	9	20

## SUBMERGED AQUATIC VEGETATION - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference

Select Disposition


6.9%

Stand-Aside


31.0%

Update

62.1%



## SUBMERGED AQUATIC VEGETATION Disposition Preference - Voting & Non-Voting Members



<b>OYSTERS</b>					
<b>Org</b>	<b>Outcome (Instruction)</b>	<b>GIT Recommendation</b>	<b>Outcome Disposition</b>	<b>Rationale for Outcome Disposition</b>	<b>Follow-Up Questions</b>
DC	Oysters	Update	Stand-Aside	DC stands aside for this Outcome.	
DE	Oysters	Update	Stand-Aside	DE is not signed on for this outcome.	
MD	Oysters	Update	Update	Agree with the recommendation and support a new measurement of acreage.	
NY	Oysters	Update	Stand-Aside	There are no oysters in NY's portion of the watershed	
PA	Oysters	Update	Stand-Aside	PA does not currently participate in this outcome.	
VA	Oysters	Update	Update	We believe the current metric for this outcome has had success, but needs to be updated to reflect jurisdictions' different management approaches and legal limitations. We would like to see this updated to incorporate broader reef restoration (i.e. artificial reef programs), coupled with an Oyster Abundance Outcome that focuses on increasing oyster abundance through sustainable fisheries management (allowing flexibility for how different jurisdictions do so).	
WV	Oysters	Update	Stand-Aside		
CBC	Oysters	Update	Update	Agree with the update	
EPA	Oysters	Update	Update	EPA supports the GIT's recommendation.	
DOD	Oysters	Update	Update		
DHS	Oysters	Update	Select Disposition		

DOT	Oysters	Update	Select Disposition		
NRCS	Oysters	Update	Stand-Aside		
USFS	Oysters	Update	Stand-Aside		
ACE	Oysters	Update	Stand-Aside		
NOAA	Oysters	Update	Update		
FWS	Oysters	Update	Update	We defer to the technical experts in the WOrkgroup	NA
NPS	Oysters	Update	Stand-Aside	NPS does not take a position on this outcome	
USGS	Oysters	Update	Update		
GIT 1	Oysters	Update	Update		
GIT 2	Oysters	Update	Update		
GIT 3	Oysters	Update	Update	Support GIT recommendation. Filter feeders contribute to a healthy ecosystem and filter the water in the Bay.	
GIT 4	Oysters	Update	Update	Agree with GIT recommendation	
GIT 5	Oysters	Update	Stand-Aside		
GIT 6	Oysters	Update	Update		
STAR	Oysters	Update	Update		
LGAC	Oysters	Update	Update		
SAC	Oysters	Update	Update	agree with the GIT	n/a
STAC	Oysters	Update	Update		


OYSTERS - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference				
Outcome Disposition	Count (total)	Average (total)	Count (voting)	Count (non-voting)
Consolidate	0	0.00%	0	0
Reclassify	0	0.00%	0	0
Remove	0	0.00%	0	0
Replace	0	0.00%	0	0
Update	17	58.62%	4	13
Stand-Aside	10	34.48%	5	5
Select Disposition	2	6.90%	0	2
SUM	29	100.00%	9	20

## OYSTERS - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference


Select Disposition  
6.9%

Stand-Aside  
34.5%

Update  
58.6%



## OYSTERS Disposition Preference - Voting & Non-Voting Members





BLUE CRAB ABUNDANCE					
Org	Outcome (Instruction)	GIT Recommendation	Outcome Disposition	Rationale for Outcome Disposition	Follow-Up Questions
DC	Blue Crab Abundance	Update	Stand-Aside	DC stands aside for this Outcome.	
DE	Blue Crab Abundance	Update	Stand-Aside	DE is not signed on for this outcome.	
MD	Blue Crab Abundance	Update	Update	Agree with the recommendation.	
NY	Blue Crab Abundance	Update	Stand-Aside	There are no blue crab in NY's portion of the watershed	
PA	Blue Crab Abundance	Update	Stand-Aside	PA does not currently participate in this outcome.	
VA	Blue Crab Abundance	Update	Update	Our disposition at this time is to update as this Outcome fosters needed collaboration and communication between partners.	
WV	Blue Crab Abundance	Update	Stand-Aside		
CBC	Blue Crab Abundance	Update	Update	Agree with the recommendation	
EPA	Blue Crab Abundance	Update	Update	EPA supports the GIT's recommendation.	
DOD	Blue Crab Abundance	Update	Stand-Aside		

DHS	Blue Crab Abundance	Update	Select Disposition		
DOT	Blue Crab Abundance	Update	Select Disposition		
NRCS	Blue Crab Abundance	Update	Stand-Aside		
USFS	Blue Crab Abundance	Update	Stand-Aside		
ACE	Blue Crab Abundance	Update	Stand-Aside		
NOAA	Blue Crab Abundance	Update	Update		
FWS	Blue Crab Abundance	Update	Update	We defer to the technical experts in the WOrkgroup	NA
NPS	Blue Crab Abundance	Update	Stand-Aside	NPS does not take a position on this outcome	
USGS	Blue Crab Abundance	Update	Update		
GIT 1	Blue Crab Abundance	Update	Update		
GIT 2	Blue Crab Abundance	Update	Update		
GIT 3	Blue Crab Abundance	Update	Stand-Aside		

GIT 4	Blue Crab Abundance	Update	Update	Agree with GIT recommendation	
GIT 5	Blue Crab Abundance	Update	Stand-Aside		
GIT 6	Blue Crab Abundance	Update	Update		
STAR	Blue Crab Abundance	Update	Update		
LGAC	Blue Crab Abundance	Update	Update		
SAC	Blue Crab Abundance	Update	Update	agree with the GIT	n/a
STAC	Blue Crab Abundance	Update	Update		

BLUE CRAB ABUNDANCE - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference				
Outcome Disposition	Count (total)	Average (total)	Count (voting)	Count (non-voting)
Consolidate	0	0.00%	0	0
Reclassify	0	0.00%	0	0
Remove	0	0.00%	0	0


<b>Replace</b>	0	0.00%	0	0
<b>Update</b>	15	51.72%	4	11
<b>Stand-Aside</b>	12	41.38%	5	7
<b>Select Disposition</b>	2	6.90%	0	2
<b>SUM</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>20</b>

## BLUE CRAB ABUNDANCE - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference


Select Disposition  
6.9%

Stand-Aside  
41.4%

Update  
51.7%



## BLUE CRAB ABUNDANCE Disposition Preference - Voting & Non-Voting Members



BLUE CRAB MANAGEMENT					
Org	Outcome (Instruction)	GIT Recommendation	Outcome Disposition	Rationale for Outcome Disposition	Follow-Up Questions
DC	Blue Crab Management	Remove	Stand-Aside	DC stands aside for this Outcome.	
DE	Blue Crab Management	Remove	Stand-Aside	DE is not signed on for this outcome.	
MD	Blue Crab Management	Remove	Remove	Agree with the recommendation.	
NY	Blue Crab Management	Remove	Stand-Aside	There are no blue crab in NY's portion of the watershed	
PA	Blue Crab Management	Remove	Stand-Aside	PA does not currently participate in this outcome.	
VA	Blue Crab Management	Remove	Remove	Agree with the GIT's recommendation.	
WV	Blue Crab Management	Remove	Stand-Aside		
CBC	Blue Crab Management	Remove	Remove	Agree with the recommendation	
EPA	Blue Crab Management	Remove	Remove	EPA supports the GIT's recommendation.	
DOD	Blue Crab Management	Remove	Stand-Aside		

DHS	Blue Crab Management	Remove	Select Disposition		
DOT	Blue Crab Management	Remove	Select Disposition		
NRCS	Blue Crab Management	Remove	Stand-Aside		
USFS	Blue Crab Management	Remove	Stand-Aside		
ACE	Blue Crab Management	Remove	Stand-Aside		
NOAA	Blue Crab Management	Remove	Remove		
FWS	Blue Crab Management	Remove	Remove	We defer to the technical experts in the WORKgroup	NA
NPS	Blue Crab Management	Remove	Stand-Aside	NPS does not take a position on this outcome	
USGS	Blue Crab Management	Remove	Remove		
GIT 1	Blue Crab Management	Remove	Remove		
GIT 2	Blue Crab Management	Remove	Remove		
GIT 3	Blue Crab Management	Remove	Remove		



GIT 4	Blue Crab Management	Remove	Remove	Agree with GIT recommendation	
GIT 5	Blue Crab Management	Remove	Stand-Aside		
GIT 6	Blue Crab Management	Remove	Remove		
STAR	Blue Crab Management	Remove	Remove		
LGAC	Blue Crab Management	Remove	Remove		
SAC	Blue Crab Management	Remove	Remove	agree with the GIT	n/a
STAC	Blue Crab Management	Remove	Remove		

BLUE CRAB MANAGEMENT - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference				
Outcome Disposition	Count (total)	Average (total)	Count (voting)	Count (non-voting)
Consolidate	0	0.00%	0	0
Reclassify	0	0.00%	0	0
Remove	16	55.17%	4	12
Replace	0	0.00%	0	0
Update	0	0.00%	0	0
Stand-Aside	11	37.93%	5	6
Select Disposition	2	6.90%	0	2

<b>SUM</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>20</b>
------------	-----------	----------------	----------	-----------

## BLUE CRAB MANAGEMENT- Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference

Select Disposition


6.9%

Stand-Aside


37.9%

Remove

55.2%



## BLUE CRAB MANAGEMENT Disposition Preference - Voting & Non-Voting Members



TOXIC CONTAMINANTS RESEARCH					
Org	Outcome (Instruction)	GIT Recommendation	Outcome Disposition	Rationale for Outcome Disposition	Follow-Up Questions
DC	Toxic Contaminants Research	<b>Consolidate</b>	<b>Consolidate</b>	DC supports the GIT's disposition.	
DE	Toxic Contaminants Research	<b>Consolidate</b>	<b>Consolidate</b>	DE agrees with recommendation.	
MD	Toxic Contaminants Research	<b>Consolidate</b>	<b>Consolidate</b>	Agree with the recommendation to consolidate into one Toxic Contaminants Outcome focusing on networking and information sharing across the partnership, both in terms of research and supporting decision-making.	
NY	Toxic Contaminants Research	<b>Consolidate</b>	<b>Consolidate</b>	Agree with the recommendations	
PA	Toxic Contaminants Research	<b>Consolidate</b>	<b>Consolidate</b>	Agree to Consolidate.	
VA	Toxic Contaminants Research	<b>Consolidate</b>	<b>Consolidate</b>	Agree to consolidate, as long as the focus in on research and information-sharing and not policy-setting.	
WV	Toxic Contaminants Research	<b>Consolidate</b>	<b>Consolidate</b>		

CBC	Toxic Contaminants Research	<b>Consolidate</b>	<b>Consolidate</b>	One Toxic outcome that encourages information sharing and collaboration across research and policy	
EPA	Toxic Contaminants Research	<b>Consolidate</b>	<b>Consolidate</b>	EPA supports the GIT's recommendation.	
DOD	Toxic Contaminants Research	<b>Consolidate</b>	<b>Stand-Aside</b>		
DHS	Toxic Contaminants Research	<b>Consolidate</b>	Select Disposition		
DOT	Toxic Contaminants Research	<b>Consolidate</b>	Select Disposition		
NRCS	Toxic Contaminants Research	<b>Consolidate</b>	<b>Stand-Aside</b>		
USFS	Toxic Contaminants Research	<b>Consolidate</b>	<b>Stand-Aside</b>		
ACE	Toxic Contaminants Research	<b>Consolidate</b>	<b>Stand-Aside</b>		


NOAA	Toxic Contaminants Research	<b>Consolidate</b>	<b>Stand-Aside</b>		
FWS	Toxic Contaminants Research	<b>Consolidate</b>	<b>Consolidate</b>	We defer to the technical experts in the WOrkgroup	NA
NPS	Toxic Contaminants Research	<b>Consolidate</b>	<b>Stand-Aside</b>	NPS does not take a position on this outcome	
USGS	Toxic Contaminants Research	<b>Consolidate</b>	<b>Consolidate</b>		
GIT 1	Toxic Contaminants Research	<b>Consolidate</b>	<b>Stand-Aside</b>		
GIT 2	Toxic Contaminants Research	<b>Consolidate</b>	<b>Consolidate</b>		
GIT 3	Toxic Contaminants Research	<b>Consolidate</b>	<b>Consolidate</b>	After further discussion and review, there is a willingness from the TCW to consolidate as long as there is thoughtful language in an updated outcome to represent the work and value added from the TCW to the partnership	
GIT 4	Toxic Contaminants Research	<b>Consolidate</b>	<b>Consolidate</b>	Agree with GIT recommendation	

GIT 5	Toxic Contaminants Research	<b>Consolidate</b>	<b>Consolidate</b>		
GIT 6	Toxic Contaminants Research	<b>Consolidate</b>	<b>Consolidate</b>		
STAR	Toxic Contaminants Research	<b>Consolidate</b>	<b>Consolidate</b>		
LGAC	Toxic Contaminants Research	<b>Consolidate</b>	<b>Consolidate</b>		
SAC	Toxic Contaminants Research	<b>Consolidate</b>	<b>Consolidate</b>	agree with outcome lead	n/a
STAC	Toxic Contaminants Research	<b>Consolidate</b>	<b>Consolidate</b>		


TOXIC CONTAMINANTS RESEARCH - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference				
Outcome Disposition	Count (total)	Average (total)	Count (voting)	Count (non-voting)
Consolidate	20	68.97%	9	11
Reclassify	0	0.00%	0	0
Remove	0	0.00%	0	0
Replace	0	0.00%	0	0
Update	0	0.00%	0	0
Stand-Aside	7	24.14%	0	7
Select Disposition	2	6.90%	0	2
SUM	29	100.00%	9	20



## TOXIC CONTAMINANTS RESEARCH - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference



## TOXIC CONTAMINANTS RESEARCH - Disposition Preference - Count (voting) and Count (non-voting)



TOXIC CONTAMINANTS POLICY AND PREVENTION					
Org	Outcome (Instruction)	GIT Recommendation	Outcome Disposition	Rationale for Outcome Disposition	Follow-Up Questions
DC	Toxic Contaminants Policy and Prevention	<b>Consolidate</b>	<b>Consolidate</b>	DC supports the GIT's disposition. Emphasize defining a scope of emerging contaminants but not limiting action to specific toxics.	
DE	Toxic Contaminants Policy and Prevention	<b>Consolidate</b>	<b>Consolidate</b>	DE agrees with recommendation.	
MD	Toxic Contaminants Policy and Prevention	<b>Consolidate</b>	<b>Consolidate</b>	Agree with the recommendation to consolidate into one Toxic Contaminants Outcome focusing on networking and information sharing across the partnership, both in terms of research and supporting decision-making.	
NY	Toxic Contaminants Policy and Prevention	<b>Consolidate</b>	<b>Consolidate</b>	Agree with the recommendations	
PA	Toxic Contaminants Policy and Prevention	<b>Consolidate</b>	<b>Consolidate</b>	Agree to Consolidate.	
VA	Toxic Contaminants Policy and Prevention	<b>Consolidate</b>	<b>Consolidate</b>	Agree to consolidate, as long as the focus in on research and information-sharing and not policy-setting.	

WV	Toxic Contaminants Policy and Prevention	Consolidate	Consolidate		
CBC	Toxic Contaminants Policy and Prevention	Consolidate	Consolidate	One Toxic outcome that encourages information sharing and collaboration across research and policy	
EPA	Toxic Contaminants Policy and Prevention	Consolidate	Consolidate	EPA supports the GIT's recommendation.	
DOD	Toxic Contaminants Policy and Prevention	Consolidate	Stand-Aside		
DHS	Toxic Contaminants Policy and Prevention	Consolidate	Select Disposition		
DOT	Toxic Contaminants Policy and Prevention	Consolidate	Select Disposition		
NRCS	Toxic Contaminants Policy and Prevention	Consolidate	Stand-Aside		


USFS	Toxic Contaminants Policy and Prevention	Consolidate	Stand-Aside		
ACE	Toxic Contaminants Policy and Prevention	Consolidate	Stand-Aside		
NOAA	Toxic Contaminants Policy and Prevention	Consolidate	Stand-Aside		
FWS	Toxic Contaminants Policy and Prevention	Consolidate	Consolidate	We defer to the technical experts in the WORKgroup	NA
NPS	Toxic Contaminants Policy and Prevention	Consolidate	Stand-Aside	NPS does not take a position on this outcome	
USGS	Toxic Contaminants Policy and Prevention	Consolidate	Consolidate		
GIT 1	Toxic Contaminants Policy and Prevention	Consolidate	Stand-Aside		

GIT 2	Toxic Contaminants Policy and Prevention	<b>Consolidate</b>	<b>Consolidate</b>		
GIT 3	Toxic Contaminants Policy and Prevention	<b>Consolidate</b>	<b>Consolidate</b>	After further discussion and review, there is a willingness from the TCW to consolidate as long as there is thoughtful language in an updated outcome to represent the work and value added from the TCW to the partnership	
GIT 4	Toxic Contaminants Policy and Prevention	<b>Consolidate</b>	<b>Consolidate</b>	Agree with GIT recommendation	
GIT 5	Toxic Contaminants Policy and Prevention	<b>Consolidate</b>	<b>Consolidate</b>		
GIT 6	Toxic Contaminants Policy and Prevention	<b>Consolidate</b>	<b>Consolidate</b>		
STAR	Toxic Contaminants Policy and Prevention	<b>Consolidate</b>	<b>Consolidate</b>		
LGAC	Toxic Contaminants	<b>Consolidate</b>	<b>Consolidate</b>		

	Policy and Prevention				
SAC	Toxic Contaminants Policy and Prevention	<b>Consolidate</b>	<b>Consolidate</b>	agree with outcome lead	n/a
STAC	Toxic Contaminants Policy and Prevention	<b>Consolidate</b>	<b>Consolidate</b>		


TOXIC CONTAMINANTS POLICY AND PREVENTION - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference				
Outcome Disposition	Count (total)	Average (total)	Count (voting)	Count (non-voting)
<b>Consolidate</b>	20	68.97%	9	11
<b>Reclassify</b>	0	0.00%	0	0
<b>Remove</b>	0	0.00%	0	0
<b>Replace</b>	0	0.00%	0	0
<b>Update</b>	0	0.00%	0	0
<b>Stand-Aside</b>	7	24.14%	0	7
<b>Select Disposition</b>	2	6.90%	0	2
<b>SUM</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>20</b>

## TOXIC CONTAMINANTS POLICY AND PREVENTION - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference





## TOXIC CONTAMINANTS POLICY AND PREVENTION - Disposition Preference - Count (voting) and Count (non-voting)



WATER QUALITY STANDARDS ATTAINMENT AND MONITORING					
Org	Outcome (Instruction)	GIT Recommendation	Outcome Disposition	Rationale for Outcome Disposition	Follow-Up Questions
DC	Water Quality Standards Attainment and Monitoring	Update	Update	DC supports the GIT's disposition.	Some outcomes, particularly those related to water quality, habitat, and living resources, could be more effective if explicitly separated into tidal and non-tidal components. This is an ideal scenario and increases buy-in from partner jurisdictions.
DE	Water Quality Standards Attainment and Monitoring	Update	Update	DE agrees with recommendation.	
MD	Water Quality Standards Attainment and Monitoring	Update	Update	Agree withh the recommendation to focus more on attainment and supportive of incorporating factors that impactliving resources and human health.	
NY	Water Quality Standards Attainment and Monitoring	Update	Update	Agree with the recommendations	
PA	Water Quality Standards Attainment and Monitoring	Update	Update	Agree to Update.	

VA	Water Quality Standards Attainment and Monitoring	Update	Update	We support an update with more emphasis on verifying modeled data and outputs with real world monitoring data and achieving a monitoring/modeling balance.	
WV	Water Quality Standards Attainment and Monitoring	Update	Update		
CBC	Water Quality Standards Attainment and Monitoring	Update	Update	Agree with the recommendation	
EPA	Water Quality Standards Attainment and Monitoring	Update	Update	EPA supports the GIT's recommendation.	
DOD	Water Quality Standards Attainment and Monitoring	Update	Update		
DHS	Water Quality Standards Attainment and Monitoring	Update	Select Disposition		
DOT	Water Quality Standards	Update	Select Disposition		


	Attainment and Monitoring				
NRCS	Water Quality Standards Attainment and Monitoring	<b>Update</b>	<b>Stand-Aside</b>		
USFS	Water Quality Standards Attainment and Monitoring	<b>Update</b>	<b>Stand-Aside</b>		
ACE	Water Quality Standards Attainment and Monitoring	<b>Update</b>	<b>Stand-Aside</b>		
NOAA	Water Quality Standards Attainment and Monitoring	<b>Update</b>	<b>Stand-Aside</b>		
FWS	Water Quality Standards Attainment and Monitoring	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>	We defer to the technical experts in the Workgroup	NA
NPS	Water Quality Standards Attainment and Monitoring	<b>Update</b>	<b>Stand-Aside</b>	NPS does not take a position on this outcome	

USGS	Water Quality Standards Attainment and Monitoring	Update	Update		
GIT 1	Water Quality Standards Attainment and Monitoring	Update	Stand-Aside		
GIT 2	Water Quality Standards Attainment and Monitoring	Update	Update		
GIT 3	Water Quality Standards Attainment and Monitoring	Update	Update	Support updating this outcome. I think it's important to recognize the connection across outcomes and how this work connects to the WIP outcome. Part of the WIP discussions express a desire to use more monitoring and trends information to convey progress.	
GIT 4	Water Quality Standards Attainment and Monitoring	Update	Update	Agree with GIT recommendation	
GIT 5	Water Quality Standards Attainment and Monitoring	Update	Stand-Aside		

GIT 6	Water Quality Standards Attainment and Monitoring	Update	Update		
STAR	Water Quality Standards Attainment and Monitoring	Update	Update		
LGAC	Water Quality Standards Attainment and Monitoring	Update	Update		
SAC	Water Quality Standards Attainment and Monitoring	Update	Update	our initial clarifying questions were answered	n/a
STAC	Water Quality Standards Attainment and Monitoring	Update	Update		


WATER QUALITY STANDARDS ATTAINMENT AND MONITORING - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference				
Outcome Disposition	Count (total)	Average (total)	Count (voting)	Count (non-voting)
Consolidate	0	0.00%	0	0
Reclassify	0	0.00%	0	0
Remove	0	0.00%	0	0
Replace	0	0.00%	0	0
Update	21	72.41%	9	12
Stand-Aside	6	20.69%	0	6
Select Disposition	2	6.90%	0	2
SUM	29	100.00%	9	20

WATER QUALITY STANDARDS ATTAINMENT AND MONITORING- Full  
MB Outcome Disposition Preference





## WATER QUALITY STANDARDS ATTAINMENT AND MONITORING - Disposition Preference - Count (voting) and Count (non-voting)



<b>2017 WATERSHED IMPLEMENTATION PLAN</b>					
<b>Org</b>	<b>Outcome (Instruction)</b>	<b>GIT Recommendation</b>	<b>Outcome Disposition</b>	<b>Rationale for Outcome Disposition</b>	<b>Follow-Up Questions</b>
DC	2017 Watershed Implementation Plans	<b>Remove</b>	<b>Remove</b>	DC supports the GIT's disposition.	
DE	2017 Watershed Implementation Plans	<b>Remove</b>	<b>Remove</b>	DE agrees with recommendation.	
MD	2017 Watershed Implementation Plans	<b>Remove</b>	<b>Remove</b>	Agree with the recommendation as long as an interim deadline is included in the 2025 WIP Outcome.	
NY	2017 Watershed Implementation Plans	<b>Remove</b>	<b>Remove</b>	Agree with the recommendations	
PA	2017 Watershed Implementation Plans	<b>Remove</b>	<b>Remove</b>	Agree to Remove.	
VA	2017 Watershed Implementation Plans	<b>Remove</b>	<b>Remove</b>	This has been completed and should be removed.	
WV	2017 Watershed Implementation Plans	<b>Remove</b>	<b>Remove</b>		


CBC	2017 Watershed Implementation Plans	Remove	Remove	Agree with the recommendation	
EPA	2017 Watershed Implementation Plans	Remove	Remove	EPA supports the GIT's recommendation.	
DOD	2017 Watershed Implementation Plans	Remove	Remove		
DHS	2017 Watershed Implementation Plans	Remove	Select Disposition		
DOT	2017 Watershed Implementation Plans	Remove	Select Disposition		
NRCS	2017 Watershed Implementation Plans	Remove	Remove		
USFS	2017 Watershed Implementation Plans	Remove	Stand-Aside		
ACE	2017 Watershed Implementation Plans	Remove	Stand-Aside		

NOAA	2017 Watershed Implementation Plans	<b>Remove</b>	<b>Stand-Aside</b>		
FWS	2017 Watershed Implementation Plans	<b>Remove</b>	<b>Stand-Aside</b>	This outcome relates to the State and EP, USFWS is not involved in this outcome	NA
NPS	2017 Watershed Implementation Plans	<b>Remove</b>	<b>Stand-Aside</b>	NPS does not take a position on this outcome	
USGS	2017 Watershed Implementation Plans	<b>Remove</b>	<b>Remove</b>		
GIT 1	2017 Watershed Implementation Plans	<b>Remove</b>	<b>Stand-Aside</b>		
GIT 2	2017 Watershed Implementation Plans	<b>Remove</b>	<b>Remove</b>		
GIT 3	2017 Watershed Implementation Plans	<b>Remove</b>	<b>Remove</b>	Support original recommendation to include incremental progress as part of the outputs under and updated 2025 WIP outcome	


GIT 4	2017 Watershed Implementation Plans	Remove	Remove	Agree with GIT recommendation	
GIT 5	2017 Watershed Implementation Plans	Remove	Remove		
GIT 6	2017 Watershed Implementation Plans	Remove	Remove		
STAR	2017 Watershed Implementation Plans	Remove	Remove		
LGAC	2017 Watershed Implementation Plans	Remove	Stand-Aside		
SAC	2017 Watershed Implementation Plans	Remove	Remove	changed from original disposition after further discussion; still really highly recommend interim targets in the updated 2025 WIP Outcome	n/a
STAC	2017 Watershed Implementation Plans	Remove	Remove		

2025 WATERSHED IMPLEMENTATION PLAN - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference				
Outcome Disposition	Count (total)	Average (total)	Count (voting)	Count (non- voting)
Consolidate	0	0.00%	0	0
Reclassify	0	0.00%	0	0
Remove	0	0.00%	0	0
Replace	0	0.00%	0	0
Update	21	72.41%	9	12
Stand-Aside	6	20.69%	0	6
Select Disposition	2	6.90%	0	2
SUM	29	100.00%	9	20

## 2025 WATERSHED IMPLEMENTATION PLAN - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference



## 2025 WATERSHED IMPLEMENTATION PLAN - Disposition Preference - Count (voting) and Count (non-voting)





<b>2025 WATERSHED IMPLEMENTATION PLAN</b>					
<b>Org</b>	<b>Outcome (Instruction)</b>	<b>GIT Recommendation</b>	<b>Outcome Disposition</b>	<b>Rationale for Outcome Disposition</b>	<b>Follow-Up Questions</b>
DC	2025 Watershed Implementation Plans	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>	DC supports the GIT's disposition.	
DE	2025 Watershed Implementation Plans	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>	DE agrees with recommendation.	
MD	2025 Watershed Implementation Plans	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>	Agree with the recommendation and support setting a new deadline for 100% implementation of current WIPs under the current model.	
NY	2025 Watershed Implementation Plans	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>	Agree with the recommendations. Keep WIP targets as an outcome	
PA	2025 Watershed Implementation Plans	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>	Agree to Update. Outcome timeframe/deadline needs further discussion.	
VA	2025 Watershed Implementation Plans	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>	The concept of an interim target has merit and is important, but requires a much larger discussion beyond this initial outcome review.	
WV	2025 Watershed Implementation Plans	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>		

CBC	2025 Watershed Implementation Plans	Update	Update	One outcome with at least two outputs: an interim target date for completing planned reductions, and tiered TMDL implementation	
EPA	2025 Watershed Implementation Plans	Update	Update	EPA supports the GIT's recommendation.	
DOD	2025 Watershed Implementation Plans	Update	Update		
DHS	2025 Watershed Implementation Plans	Update	Select Disposition		
DOT	2025 Watershed Implementation Plans	Update	Select Disposition		
NRCS	2025 Watershed Implementation Plans	Update	Stand-Aside		
USFS	2025 Watershed Implementation Plans	Update	Stand-Aside		
ACE	2025 Watershed Implementation Plans	Update	Stand-Asde		

NOAA	2025 Watershed Implementation Plans	Update	Stand-Aside		
FWS	2025 Watershed Implementation Plans	Update	Stand-Aside	This outcome relates to the State and EP, USFWS is not involved in this outcome	NA
NPS	2025 Watershed Implementation Plans	Update	Stand-Aside	NPS does not take a position on this outcome	
USGS	2025 Watershed Implementation Plans	Update	Update		
GIT 1	2025 Watershed Implementation Plans	Update	Stand-Aside		
GIT 2	2025 Watershed Implementation Plans	Update	Update		
GIT 3	2025 Watershed Implementation Plans	Update	Update	Support updaing this outcome. There is still more work to do to achieve this outcome. Hope members review the caveats for this outcome.	
GIT 4	2025 Watershed Implementation Plans	Update	Update	Agree with GIT recommendation	

GIT 5	2025 Watershed Implementation Plans	Update	Update		
GIT 6	2025 Watershed Implementation Plans	Update	Update		
STAR	2025 Watershed Implementation Plans	Update	Update		
LGAC	2025 Watershed Implementation Plans	Update	Update		
SAC	2025 Watershed Implementation Plans	Update	Update	Update this outcome with a deadline and also an interim deadline for when the practices should be in place as two parts of one outcome, rather than have them as an outcome and an output. Both deadlines are important.	n/a
STAC	2025 Watershed Implementation Plans	Update	Update		

2025 WATERSHED IMPLEMENTATION PLAN - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference				
Outcome Disposition	Count (total)	Average (total)	Count (voting)	Count (non- voting)
Consolidate	0	0.00%	0	0
Reclassify	0	0.00%	0	0
Remove	0	0.00%	0	0
Replace	0	0.00%	0	0
Update	21	72.41%	9	12
Stand-Aside	6	20.69%	0	6
Select Disposition	2	6.90%	0	2
SUM	29	100.00%	9	20


## 2025 WATERSHED IMPLEMENTATION PLAN - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference

Select Disposition

6.9%

Stand-Aside


20.7%



Update

72.4%

## 2025 WATERSHED IMPLEMENTATION PLAN - Disposition Preference - Count (voting) and Count (non-voting)




<b>BLACK DUCK</b>					
<b>Org</b>	<b>Outcome (Instruction)</b>	<b>GIT Recommendation</b>	<b>Outcome Disposition</b>	<b>Rationale for Outcome Disposition</b>	<b>Follow-Up Questions</b>
DC	Black Duck	Reclassify	Reclassify	DC supports the GIT's disposition.	
DE	Black Duck	Reclassify	Reclassify	DE agrees with recommendation.	
MD	Black Duck	Reclassify	Reclassify	Agree with the recommendation to reclassify under Wetlands Outcome.	
NY	Black Duck	Reclassify	Stand-Aside	NY does not participate in this outcome	
PA	Black Duck	Reclassify	Stand-Aside	PA does not currently participate in this outcome.	
VA	Black Duck	Reclassify	Reclassify	Agree with the GIT's recommendation.	
WV	Black Duck	Reclassify	Stand-Aside		
CBC	Black Duck	Reclassify	Reclassify	Reclassify as an indicator of wetlands	
EPA	Black Duck	Reclassify	Reclassify	EPA supports the GIT's recommendation.	
DOD	Black Duck	Reclassify	Reclassify		
DHS	Black Duck	Reclassify	Select Disposition		
DOT	Black Duck	Reclassify	Select Disposition		
NRCS	Black Duck	Reclassify	Stand-Aside		
USFS	Black Duck	Reclassify	Stand-Aside		
ACE	Black Duck	Reclassify	Stand-Aside		




NOAA	Black Duck	Reclassify	Reclassify		
FWS	Black Duck	Reclassify	Reclassify	We defer to the technical experts in the Workgroup	NA
NPS	Black Duck	Reclassify	Stand-Aside	NPS does not take a position on this outcome	
USGS	Black Duck	Reclassify	Reclassify		
GIT 1	Black Duck	Reclassify	Stand-Aside		
GIT 2	Black Duck	Reclassify	Reclassify		
GIT 3	Black Duck	Reclassify	Stand-Aside	Stand aside	
GIT 4	Black Duck	Reclassify	Reclassify	Agree with GIT recommendation	
GIT 5	Black Duck	Reclassify	Stand-Aside		
GIT 6	Black Duck	Reclassify	Reclassify		
STAR	Black Duck	Reclassify	Reclassify		
LGAC	Black Duck	Reclassify	Reclassify		
SAC	Black Duck	Reclassify	Reclassify	agree with reclassifying	n/a
STAC	Black Duck	Reclassify	Reclassify		

BLACK DUCK - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference				
Outcome Disposition	Count (total)	Average (total)	Count (voting)	Count (non-voting)
Consolidate	0	0.00%	0	0
Reclassify	17	58.62%	6	11
Remove	0	0.00%	0	0
Replace	0	0.00%	0	0
Update	0	0.00%	0	0
Stand-Aside	10	34.48%	3	7
Select Disposition	2	6.90%	0	2
SUM	29	100.00%	9	20

## BLACK DUCK - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference



## BLACK DUCK Disposition Preference - Voting & Non-Voting Members



<b>WETLANDS</b>					
<b>Org</b>	<b>Outcome (Instruction)</b>	<b>GIT Recommendation</b>	<b>Outcome Disposition</b>	<b>Rationale for Outcome Disposition</b>	<b>Follow-Up Questions</b>
DC	Wetlands	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>	Support the GITs disposition but do not support the creation of two new outcomes.	
DE	Wetlands	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>	DE agrees with recommendation.	
MD	Wetlands	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>	Agree with the recommendation and would support having separately focused tidal and nontidal workgroups, either as two outputs under one Outcome or as two Outcomes.	
NY	Wetlands	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>	Agree with the recommendations	
PA	Wetlands	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>	Agree to Update. Tidal/Nontidal should be considered as outputs under Wetlands.	
VA	Wetlands	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>	We are supportive of updating with a more realistic target, but not splitting into two separate Outcomes.	
WV	Wetlands	<b>Update</b>	<b>Stand-Aside</b>		
CBC	Wetlands	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>	Update as one outcome with a tidal and nontidal output.	
EPA	Wetlands	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>	EPA has a preference for one outcome with two outputs	
DOD	Wetlands	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>		

DHS	Wetlands	Update	Select Disposition		
DOT	Wetlands	Update	Select Disposition		
NRCS	Wetlands	Update	Stand-Aside		
USFS	Wetlands	Update	Update	Support updating the outcome and maintaining in the agreement	
ACE	Wetlands	Update	Stand-Aside		
NOAA	Wetlands	Update	Update		
FWS	Wetlands	Update	Update	We defer to the technical experts in the Workgroup	NA
NPS	Wetlands	Update	Stand-Aside	NPS does not take a position on this outcome	
USGS	Wetlands	Update	Update		
GIT 1	Wetlands	Update	Stand-Aside	Wetlands are important fish habitat and we intend to work with wetlands workgroup to incorporate SAV in tidal fish habitat assessment	
GIT 2	Wetlands	Update	Update		
GIT 3	Wetlands	Update	Update	Support GIT recommendation. Wetlands are an important component of meeting the WIP outcome and support approaches to restore, protect, maintain etc wetlands.	
GIT 4	Wetlands	Update	Update	Agree with GIT recommendation	Integrate Land Use Methods and Metrics outputs into the


					management strategy for this outcome.
GIT 5	Wetlands	Update	Update		
GIT 6	Wetlands	Update	Update		
STAR	Wetlands	Update	Update		
LGAC	Wetlands	Update	Update		
SAC	Wetlands	Update	Update	agree with updating and distinguishing between tidal and nontidal, but maybe not as two distinct outcomes	n/a
STAC	Wetlands	Update	Update		

WETLANDS - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference				
Outcome Disposition	Count (total)	Average (total)	Count (voting)	Count (non-voting)
Consolidate	0	0.00%	0	0
Reclassify	0	0.00%	0	0
Remove	0	0.00%	0	0
Replace	0	0.00%	0	0
Update	22	75.86%	8	14
Stand-Aside	5	17.24%	1	4
Select Disposition	2	6.90%	0	2
SUM	29	100.00%	9	20

## WETLANDS - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference

Select Disposition  
6.9%


Stand-Aside  
17.2%



Update  
75.9%



## WETLANDS Disposition Preference - Voting & Non-Voting Members



<b>LOCAL LEADERSHIP</b>					
<b>Org</b>	<b>Outcome (Instruction)</b>	<b>GIT Recommendation</b>	<b>Outcome Disposition</b>	<b>Rationale for Outcome Disposition</b>	<b>Follow-Up Questions</b>
DC	Local Leadership	Update	Stand-Aside	DC stands aside for this Outcome.	
DE	Local Leadership	Update	Update	DE agrees with recommendation.	
MD	Local Leadership	Update	Update	Agree with the recommendation.	
NY	Local Leadership	Update	Update	Agree with the recommendations	
PA	Local Leadership	Update	Update	Agree to Update.	
VA	Local Leadership	Update	Update	Agree with the GIT's recommendation.	
WV	Local Leadership	Update	Stand-Aside		
CBC	Local Leadership	Update	Update	Agree with the recommendation	
EPA	Local Leadership	Update	Update	EPA supports the GIT's recommendation.	
DOD	Local Leadership	Update	Stand-Aside		

DHS	Local Leadership	Update	Select Disposition		
DOT	Local Leadership	Update	Select Disposition		
NRCS	Local Leadership	Update	Stand-Aside		
USFS	Local Leadership	Update	Update	Support the recommendation of the workgroup and maintaining this as an outcome in the agreement	
ACE	Local Leadership	Update	Stand-Aside		
NOAA	Local Leadership	Update	Stand-Aside		
FWS	Local Leadership	Update	Update	We defer to the technical experts in the Workgroup	NA
NPS	Local Leadership	Update	Stand-Aside	NPS does not take a position on this outcome	
USGS	Local Leadership	Update	Update		
GIT 1	Local Leadership	Update	Stand-Aside		
GIT 2	Local Leadership	Update	Update		

GIT 3	Local Leadership	Update	Update	there was good discussion across the partnership about what an update would look like or how this gets built in to the structure. Local engagement and leadership is critical to the success of many outcomes including water quality	
GIT 4	Local Leadership	Update	Update	Agree with GIT recommendation	Integrate information outputs from the Land Use Decision Support outcome (formerly Land Use Options Evaluation) into the management strategy for this outcome.
GIT 5	Local Leadership	Update	Update		
GIT 6	Local Leadership	Update	Update		
STAR	Local Leadership	Update	Update		
LGAC	Local Leadership	Update	Update		
SAC	Local Leadership	Update	Update	support keeping the outcome and workgroup, as it serves a different (if complementary) role from LGAC	n/a
STAC	Local Leadership	Update	Update		


LOCAL LEADERSHIP - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference				
Outcome Disposition	Count (total)	Average (total)	Count (voting)	Count (non-voting)
Consolidate	0	0.00%	0	0
Reclassify	0	0.00%	0	0
Remove	0	0.00%	0	0
Replace	0	0.00%	0	0
Update	20	68.97%	7	13
Stand-Aside	7	24.14%	2	5
Select Disposition	2	6.90%	0	2
SUM	29	100.00%	9	20

## LOCAL LEADERSHIP - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference


Select Disposition  
6.9%

Stand-Aside  
24.1%

Update  
69.0%



## LOCAL LEADERSHIP - Disposition Preference - Count (voting) and Count (non-voting)




<b>ADAPTATION</b>					
<b>Org</b>	<b>Outcome (Instruction)</b>	<b>GIT Recommendation</b>	<b>Outcome Disposition</b>	<b>Rationale for Outcome Disposition</b>	<b>Follow-Up Questions</b>
DC	Adaptation	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>	DC supports the GIT's disposition.	
DE	Adaptation	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>	DE agrees with recommendation.	
MD	Adaptation	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>	Agree with the recommendation.	
NY	Adaptation	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>	Agree with the recommendations	
PA	Adaptation	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>	Agree to Update.	
VA	Adaptation	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>	Many large scale resiliency projects require collaboration across partners. Supportive of either changing language to "Changing Environmental Conditions" or leaving it as an Adaptation outcome.	
WV	Adaptation	<b>Update</b>	<b>Stand-Aside</b>		
CBC	Adaptation	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>	Agree with the recommendation	
EPA	Adaptation	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>	EPA agrees with the GIT's recommendation	
DOD	Adaptation	<b>Update</b>	<b>Stand-Aside</b>		
DHS	Adaptation	<b>Update</b>	Select Disposition		
DOT	Adaptation	<b>Update</b>	Select Disposition		
NRCS	Adaptation	<b>Update</b>	<b>Stand-Aside</b>		




USFS	Adaptation	Update	Stand-Aside		
ACE	Adaptation	Update	Stand-Aside		
NOAA	Adaptation	Update	Stand-Aside		
FWS	Adaptation	Update	Update	We defer to the technical experts in the Workgroup	NA
NPS	Adaptation	Update	Update		
USGS	Adaptation	Update	Update		
GIT 1	Adaptation	Update	Stand-Aside		
GIT 2	Adaptation	Update	Update		
GIT 3	Adaptation	Update	Update	Agree with recommendations and discussions	
GIT 4	Adaptation	Update	Update	Agree with GIT recommendation	Integrate Land Use Methods and Metrics outputs into the management strategy for this outcome.
GIT 5	Adaptation	Update	Stand-Aside		
GIT 6	Adaptation	Update	Update		
STAR	Adaptation	Update	Stand-Aside		
LGAC	Adaptation	Update	Update		
SAC	Adaptation	Update	Update	agree with recommendation, include watershed and not just estuarine	n/a
STAC	Adaptation	Update	Update		

ADAPTATION - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference				
Outcome Disposition	Count (total)	Average (total)	Count (voting)	Count (non-voting)
Consolidate	0	0.00%	0	0
Reclassify	0	0.00%	0	0
Remove	0	0.00%	0	0
Replace	0	0.00%	0	0
Update	19	65.52%	8	11
Stand-Aside	8	27.59%	1	7
Select Disposition	2	6.90%	0	2
SUM	29	100.00%	9	20

ADAPTATION - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference



## ADAPTATION - Disposition Preference - Count (voting) and Count (non-voting)



LAND USE METHODS AND METRICS DEVELOPMENT					
Org	Outcome (Instruction)	GIT Recommendation	Outcome Disposition	Rationale for Outcome Disposition	Follow-Up Questions
DC	Land Use Methods and Metrics Development	Reclassify	Reclassify	DC supports the GIT's disposition.	
DE	Land Use Methods and Metrics Development	Reclassify	Reclassify	DE agrees with recommendation.	
MD	Land Use Methods and Metrics Development	Reclassify	Reclassify	Agree with the recommendation to reclassify as output under new Land Use Decision Support Outcome.	
NY	Land Use Methods and Metrics Development	Reclassify	Reclassify	Agree with the recommendations	
PA	Land Use Methods and Metrics Development	Reclassify	Reclassify	Agree to Reclassify under Land Use Decision Support.	

VA	Land Use Methods and Metrics Development	Reclassify	Reclassify	Agree to incorporate this into a Land Use Decision Support Outcome.	
WV	Land Use Methods and Metrics Development	Reclassify	Stand-Aside		
CBC	Land Use Methods and Metrics Development	Reclassify	Reclassify	Reclassify as an output of a single Land Use outcome	
EPA	Land Use Methods and Metrics Development	Reclassify	Reclassify	EPA supports the GIT recommendation but has concerns about the caveats identified in supporting documentation.	
DOD	Land Use Methods and Metrics Development	Reclassify	Reclassify		
DHS	Land Use Methods and Metrics Development	Reclassify	Select Disposition		
DOT	Land Use Methods and	Reclassify	Select Disposition		

	Metrics Development				
NRCS	Land Use Methods and Metrics Development	Reclassify	Stand-Aside		
USFS	Land Use Methods and Metrics Development	Reclassify	Reclassify	Support the recommendation of the workgroup and including this work as an output of other outcomes	
ACE	Land Use Methods and Metrics Development	Reclassify	Stand-Aside		
NOAA	Land Use Methods and Metrics Development	Reclassify	Stand-Aside		
FWS	Land Use Methods and Metrics Development	Reclassify	Reclassify	We defer to the technical experts in the WORKgroup	NA
NPS	Land Use Methods and Metrics Development	Reclassify	Stand-Aside	NPS does not take a position on this outcome	

USGS	Land Use Methods and Metrics Development	Reclassify	Reclassify		
GIT 1	Land Use Methods and Metrics Development	Reclassify	Stand- Aside		
GIT 2	Land Use Methods and Metrics Development	Reclassify	Reclassify	Is this still going with HW?	
GIT 3	Land Use Methods and Metrics Development	Reclassify	Reclassify	Support GIT recommendations	
GIT 4	Land Use Methods and Metrics Development	Reclassify	Reclassify	Agree with GIT recommendation	
GIT 5	Land Use Methods and Metrics Development	Reclassify	Reclassify		
GIT 6	Land Use Methods and Metrics Development	Reclassify	Reclassify		



STAR	Land Use Methods and Metrics Development	Reclassify	Reclassify		
LGAC	Land Use Methods and Metrics Development	Reclassify	Reclassify		
SAC	Land Use Methods and Metrics Development	Reclassify	Reclassify	so much mapping, so little decision making	n/a
STAC	Land Use Methods and Metrics Development	Reclassify	Reclassify		

LAND USE METHODS AND METRICS DEVELOPMENT - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference				
Outcome Disposition	Count (total)	Average (total)	Count (voting)	Count (non- voting)
Consolidate	0	0.00%	0	0
Reclassify	21	72.41%	8	13
Remove	0	0.00%	0	0
Replace	0	0.00%	0	0
Update	0	0.00%	0	0
Stand-Aside	6	20.69%	1	5
Select Disposition	2	6.90%	0	2
SUM	29	100.00%	9	20

## LAND USE METHODS AND METRICS DEVELOPMENT - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference

Select Disposition


6.9%

Stand-Aside


20.7%

Reclassify

72.4%



## LAND USE METHODS AND METRICS DEVELOPMENT - Disposition Preference - Count (voting) and Count (non-voting)




TREE CANOPY					
Org	Outcome (Instruction)	GIT Recommendation	Outcome Disposition	Rationale for Outcome Disposition	Follow-Up Questions
DC	Tree Canopy	Update	Update	DC supports the GIT's disposition.	
DE	Tree Canopy	Update	Update	DE agrees with recommendation.	
MD	Tree Canopy	Update	Update	Agree with the recommendation.	
NY	Tree Canopy	Update	Update	Agree with the recommendations	
PA	Tree Canopy	Update	Reclassify	Reclassify as an output under a new Forest Conservation Outcome in the Watershed Health, (Forest?) and Land Conservation Goal.	
VA	Tree Canopy	Update	Update	We are open to what consolidation with forest buffers looks like.	
WV	Tree Canopy	Update	Update		
CBC	Tree Canopy	Update	Update	Agree with the recommendation	
EPA	Tree Canopy	Update	Update	EPA encourages a move to consolidate the forestry outcomes but is willing to support an update.	
DOD	Tree Canopy	Update	Update		
DHS	Tree Canopy	Update	Select Disposition		
DOT	Tree Canopy	Update	Select Disposition		
NRCS	Tree Canopy	Update	Update		

USFS	Tree Canopy	Update	Update	Support the recommendation of the workgroup but are open to considering a broader "forests and trees" outcome as long as specific targets are set for riparian forests within the agreement	
ACE	Tree Canopy	Update	Stand-Aside		
NOAA	Tree Canopy	Update	Stand-Aside		
FWS	Tree Canopy	Update	Update	We defer to the technical experts in the Workgroup	NA
NPS	Tree Canopy	Update	Update		
USGS	Tree Canopy	Update	Update		
GIT 1	Tree Canopy	Update	Stand-Aside		
GIT 2	Tree Canopy	Update	Update		
GIT 3	Tree Canopy	Update	Update	The developed sector continues to be an area where the partnership struggles in meeting the WIP Outcome and to see progress because growth is outpacing implementation in many cases. Trees are a visible metric that the public can connect with and there is a lot of WQGIT support for trees as BMPs to improve local water quality and ultimately the WQ in the Bay. There are O&M concerns in developed areas related to trees and the partnership could help bridge that communication on the importance of trees and the ecosystem and human health benefits that come from trees.	
GIT 4	Tree Canopy	Update	Update	Agree with GIT recommendation	Integrate Land Use Methods and Metrics outputs into the

					management strategy for this outcome.
GIT 5	Tree Canopy	Update	Update		
GIT 6	Tree Canopy	Update	Update		
STAR	Tree Canopy	Update	Update		
LGAC	Tree Canopy	Update	Update		
SAC	Tree Canopy	Update	Update	must include ways to mitigate loss; with the shift to "community," continue to prioritize areas without canopy	n/a
STAC	Tree Canopy	Update	Update		


TREE CANOPY - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference				
Outcome Disposition	Count (total)	Average (total)	Count (voting)	Count (non-voting)
Consolidate	0	0.00%	0	0
Reclassify	1	3.45%	1	0
Remove	0	0.00%	0	0
Replace	0	0.00%	0	0
Update	23	79.31%	8	15
Stand-Aside	3	10.34%	0	3
Select Disposition	2	6.90%	0	2
SUM	29	100.00%	9	20

# TREE CANOPY - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference





## TREE CANOPY - Disposition Preference - Count (voting) and Count (non-voting)




FOREST BUFFERS					
Org	Outcome (Instruction)	GIT Recommendation	Outcome Disposition	Rationale for Outcome Disposition	Follow-Up Questions
DC	Forest Buffers	Update	Update	DC supports the GIT's disposition.	
DE	Forest Buffers	Update	Update	DE agrees with recommendation.	
MD	Forest Buffers	Update	Update	Agree with the recommendation.	
NY	Forest Buffers	Update	Update	Agree with the recommendations	
PA	Forest Buffers	Update	Reclassify	Reclassify as an output under a new Forest Conservation Outcome in the Watershed Health, (Forest?) and Land Conservation Goal.	
VA	Forest Buffers	Update	Update	We are open to what consolidation with tree canopy looks like.	
WV	Forest Buffers	Update	Update		
CBC	Forest Buffers	Update	Update	Agree with the recommendation	
EPA	Forest Buffers	Update	Update	EPA encourages a move to consolidate the forestry outcomes but is willing to support an update.	
DOD	Forest Buffers	Update	Update		
DHS	Forest Buffers	Update	Select Disposition		
DOT	Forest Buffers	Update	Select Disposition		
NRCS	Forest Buffers	Update	Update		

USFS	Forest Buffers	Update	Update	Support the recommendation of the workgroup but are open to considering a broader "forests and trees" outcome as long as specific targets are set for tree canopy within the agreement	
ACE	Forest Buffers	Update	Stand-Aside		
NOAA	Forest Buffers	Update	Stand-Aside		
FWS	Forest Buffers	Update	Update	We defer to the technical experts in the WOrkgroup	NA
NPS	Forest Buffers	Update	Update		
USGS	Forest Buffers	Update	Update		
GIT 1	Forest Buffers	Update	Stand-Aside		
GIT 2	Forest Buffers	Update	Update		
GIT 3	Forest Buffers	Update	Update	Buffers are a key element of the WIPs for how partners will meet the WIP outcome. As noted above, trees are a metric that the public can connect with and support. agree with the recommendations.	
GIT 4	Forest Buffers	Update	Update	Agree with GIT recommendation	Integrate Land Use Methods and Metrics outputs into the management strategy for this outcome.
GIT 5	Forest Buffers	Update	Update		
GIT 6	Forest Buffers	Update	Update		


STAR	Forest Buffers	Update	Update		
LGAC	Forest Buffers	Update	Update		
SAC	Forest Buffers	Update	Update	like long-term and interim goals, maintenance is key	n/a
STAC	Forest Buffers	Update	Update		

FOREST BUFFERS - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference				
Outcome Disposition	Count (total)	Average (total)	Count (voting)	Count (non-voting)
Consolidate	0	0.00%	0	0
Reclassify	1	3.45%	1	0
Remove	0	0.00%	0	0
Replace	0	0.00%	0	0
Update	23	79.31%	8	15
Stand-Aside	3	10.34%	0	3
Select Disposition	2	6.90%	0	2
SUM	29	100.00%	9	20

## FOREST BUFFERS - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference



## FOREST BUFFERS - Disposition Preference - Count (voting) and Count (non-voting)



MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT					
Org	Outcome (Instruction)	GIT Recommendation	Outcome Disposition	Rationale for Outcome Disposition	Follow-Up Questions
DC	Monitoring and Assessment	Replace	Replace	DC supports the GIT's disposition.	If this Outcome is replaced by an internal "consulting" group, there will need to be accountability measures built into the structure of other Outcomes.
DE	Monitoring and Assessment	Replace	Replace	DE agrees with recommendation.	
MD	Monitoring and Assessment	Replace	Reclassify	Suggest reclassifying on the condition that, in line with the MB discussion, space and resources are made available for this work to happen within the partnership in some capacity other than as an Outcome.	
NY	Monitoring and Assessment	Replace	Replace	Agree with recommendations to include a climate resiliency assessment framework	
PA	Monitoring and Assessment	Replace	Replace	Agree to Replace.	
VA	Monitoring and Assessment	Replace	Reclassify	Our understanding was that all partners agreed this new concept did not need to be an outcome and how to reclassify would be determined later.	

WV	Monitoring and Assessment	Replace	Stand-Aside		
CBC	Monitoring and Assessment	Replace	Reclassify	Reclassify as an output of the "Adaptation" outcome or an activity necessary across all other outcomes (perhaps similar to communication)	
EPA	Monitoring and Assessment	Replace	Reclassify	EPA supports a consultant role for this outcome.	
DOD	Monitoring and Assessment	Replace	Stand-Aside		
DHS	Monitoring and Assessment	Replace	Select Disposition		
DOT	Monitoring and Assessment	Replace	Select Disposition		
NRCS	Monitoring and Assessment	Replace	Stand-Aside		
USFS	Monitoring and Assessment	Replace	Stand-Aside		




ACE	Monitoring and Assessment	Replace	Stand-Aside		
NOAA	Monitoring and Assessment	Replace	Stand-Aside		
FWS	Monitoring and Assessment	Replace	Replace	We defer to the technical experts in the Workgroup	NA
NPS	Monitoring and Assessment	Replace	Replace		
USGS	Monitoring and Assessment	Replace	Replace		
GIT 1	Monitoring and Assessment	Replace	Stand-Aside		
GIT 2	Monitoring and Assessment	Replace	Replace		
GIT 3	Monitoring and Assessment	Replace	Stand-Aside	I don't understand what this is shifting to in order to weigh in on behalf of the WQGIT. Stand aside is not necessarily agreement here. I don't feel comfortable giving a disposition with so much unknown.	Question to MB: how can we weigh in with a disposition when we don't know what this will turn into? Seems premature to ask for something right now on this one.


GIT 4	Monitoring and Assessment	Replace	Replace	Agree with GIT recommendation	Integrate Land Use Methods and Metrics outputs into the management strategy for this outcome.
GIT 5	Monitoring and Assessment	Replace	Stand-Aside		
GIT 6	Monitoring and Assessment	Replace	Replace		
STAR	Monitoring and Assessment	Replace	Stand-Aside		
LGAC	Monitoring and Assessment	Replace	Replace		
SAC	Monitoring and Assessment	Replace	Replace	agree with outcome lead	n/a
STAC	Monitoring and Assessment	Replace	Replace		

MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT- Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference				
Outcome Disposition	Count (total)	Average (total)	Count (voting)	Count (non-voting)
Consolidate	0	0.00%	0	0
Reclassify	4	13.79%	4	0
Remove	0	0.00%	0	0
Replace	14	48.28%	4	10
Update	0	0.00%	0	0
Stand-Aside	9	31.03%	1	8
Select Disposition	2	6.90%	0	2
SUM	29	100.00%	9	20

## MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference



## MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT - Disposition Preference - Count (voting) and Count (non-voting)



LAND USE OPTIONS EVALUATION					
Org	Outcome (Instruction)	GIT Recommendation	Outcome Disposition	Rationale for Outcome Disposition	Follow-Up Questions
DC	Land Use Options Evaluation	Replace	Replace	DC supports the GIT's disposition.	
DE	Land Use Options Evaluation	Replace	Replace	DE agrees with recommendation.	
MD	Land Use Options Evaluation	Replace	Replace	Agree with the recommendation to replace with a new Land Use Decision Support Outcome.	
NY	Land Use Options Evaluation	Replace	Replace	Agree with the recommendations	
PA	Land Use Options Evaluation	Replace	Replace	Agree to Replace LUO with Land Use Decision Support.	
VA	Land Use Options Evaluation	Replace	Replace	Agree to incorporate this into a Land Use Decision Support Outcome.	
WV	Land Use Options Evaluation	Replace	Stand-Aside		

CBC	Land Use Options Evaluation	Replace	Replace	Would like to see the information provided to decisionmakers include not just landscape conditions and environmental consequences, but options or best practices as well.	
EPA	Land Use Options Evaluation	Replace	Replace	EPA supports the GIT recommendation but has concerns about the caveats identified in supporting documentation.	
DOD	Land Use Options Evaluation	Replace	Replace	Agree with replace as outlined in revised 2 pager recognizing that DoD REPI opportunity zones and sentinel landscapes partner priorities will be useful references for land use planning efforts and land conservation.	
DHS	Land Use Options Evaluation	Replace	Select Disposition		
DOT	Land Use Options Evaluation	Replace	Select Disposition		
NRCS	Land Use Options Evaluation	Replace	Stand-Aside		
USFS	Land Use Options Evaluation	Replace	Replace	Support the workgroup, but would prefer to maintain a broader land use outcome rather than just focusing on decision support which seems more like an activity	Is there an opportunity to more directly address the loss of forests and natural lands to development? We will not meet our water quality and ecosystem restoration goals for

					the watershed if we can't reduce this rate of loss
ACE	Land Use Options Evaluation	Replace	Stand-Aside		
NOAA	Land Use Options Evaluation	Replace	Stand-Aside		
FWS	Land Use Options Evaluation	Replace	Replace	We defer to the technical experts in the WOrkgroup	NA
NPS	Land Use Options Evaluation	Replace	Stand-Aside	NPS does not take a position on this outcome	
USGS	Land Use Options Evaluation	Replace	Replace		
GIT 1	Land Use Options Evaluation	Replace	Stand-Aside		
GIT 2	Land Use Options Evaluation	Replace	Replace		
GIT 3	Land Use Options Evaluation	Replace	Replace	From the WQGIT, members have expressed that there are numerous challenges to meeting the WIP Outcome, including local land use planning as one of the challenges in	




				meeting the WIP outcome. Partners do not want to dictate local land use planning, but there seems to be a role for the partnership in trying to improve how we work with locals on protecting water quality and living resources. The option to replace seems to maintain there is a role for the partnership to inform and work with local organizations.	
GIT 4	Land Use Options Evaluation	<b>Replace</b>	<b>Replace</b>	Agree with GIT recommendation	
GIT 5	Land Use Options Evaluation	<b>Replace</b>	<b>Replace</b>		
GIT 6	Land Use Options Evaluation	<b>Replace</b>	<b>Replace</b>		
STAR	Land Use Options Evaluation	<b>Replace</b>	<b>Replace</b>		
LGAC	Land Use Options Evaluation	<b>Replace</b>	<b>Replace</b>		
SAC	Land Use Options Evaluation	<b>Replace</b>	<b>Replace</b>	agree with outcome lead	n/a


STAC	Land Use Options Evaluation	Replace	Update		
------	-----------------------------------	---------	--------	--	--

LAND USE OPTIONS EVALUATION - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference				
Outcome Disposition	Count (total)	Average (total)	Count (voting)	Count (non-voting)
Consolidate	0	0.00%	0	0
Reclassify	0	0.00%	0	0
Remove	0	0.00%	0	0
Replace	20	68.97%	8	12
Update	1	3.45%	0	1
Stand-Aside	6	20.69%	1	5
Select Disposition	2	6.90%	0	2
SUM	29	100.00%	9	20

## LAND USE OPTIONS EVALUATION - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference



## LAND USE OPTIONS EVALUATION - Disposition Preference - Count (voting) and Count (non-voting)



HEALTHY WATERSHEDS					
Org	Outcome (Instruction)	GIT Recommendation	Outcome Disposition	Rationale for Outcome Disposition	Follow-Up Questions
DC	Healthy Watersheds	Reclassify	Reclassify	DC supports the GIT's disposition.	
DE	Healthy Watersheds	Reclassify	Reclassify	DE agrees with recommendation.	
MD	Healthy Watersheds	Reclassify	Reclassify	Tentatively agree with recommendation to reclassify as outputs under other Outcomes, but extremely uncomfortable with removing Healthy Watersheds as an Outcome. Protecting watersheds with high ecological value is one of the Outcomes that has impacts for everyone who lives in the Bay watershed, and is at the heart of the partnership's Vision and work. We are supportive of the idea of better integrating the Healthy Watersheds work across other Outcomes, like Stream Health, Protected Lands, and Land Use Decision Support, but think that Watershed Health is core to what we are trying to achieve and what the EC has charged us with prioritizing in this revision process.	
NY	Healthy Watersheds	Reclassify	Reclassify	Agree with the recommendations	
PA	Healthy Watersheds	Reclassify	Reclassify	Agree to Reclassify. Instead of Stream Health, it could be an output under the Nontidal Fish Habitat Novel Outcome as well as Protected Lands. The name of the Healthy Watersheds Goal should be "Watershed Health, Forest, and Land Protection".	

VA	Healthy Watersheds	Reclassify	Reclassify	We do not see value in keeping this as a standalone outcome, but are unsure of the best reclassification/consolidation option at this time.	
WV	Healthy Watersheds	Reclassify	Replace		
CBC	Healthy Watersheds	Reclassify	Reclassify	Remove as a separate goal and outcome and integrate into other goals and outcomes as appropriate.	
EPA	Healthy Watersheds	Reclassify	Reclassify	EPA supports the GIT recommendation but has concerns about the caveats identified in supporting documentation.	
DOD	Healthy Watersheds	Reclassify	Stand-Aside		
DHS	Healthy Watersheds	Reclassify	Select Disposition		
DOT	Healthy Watersheds	Reclassify	Select Disposition		
NRCS	Healthy Watersheds	Reclassify	Stand-Aside		
USFS	Healthy Watersheds	Reclassify	Reclassify	Support the GIT, but preferred the previously proposed outcome revisions that had an emphasis on the conservation and stewardship of upland forests and timberlands	Where can we increase focus on the importance of conserving and stewarding upland forests (in addition to the permanent protection sub-goals established by

					the protected lands outcome)?
ACE	Healthy Watersheds	Reclassify	Stand-Aside		
NOAA	Healthy Watersheds	Reclassify	Stand-Aside		
FWS	Healthy Watersheds	Reclassify	Reclassify	We defer to the technical experts in the Workgroup	NA
NPS	Healthy Watersheds	Reclassify	Stand-Aside	NPS does not take a position on this outcome	
USGS	Healthy Watersheds	Reclassify	Update	I have not had ANY chance to review the proposal for moving these efforts under other Outcomes. I would have preferred to update this to Watershed Health, but willing to look at the evolved approach	
GIT 1	Healthy Watersheds	Reclassify	Stand-Aside		
GIT 2	Healthy Watersheds	Reclassify	Reclassify	I am not clear on the change to reclassify. Can you send me (again probably) what it will be reclassified with?	
GIT 3	Healthy Watersheds	Reclassify	Reclassify	WQGIT wasn't in follow up conversations on this topic. Based on the write up it seems like the work will continue as outputs.	
GIT 4	Healthy Watersheds	Reclassify	Reclassify	Agree with GIT recommendation	


GIT 5	Healthy Watersheds	Reclassify	Reclassify		
GIT 6	Healthy Watersheds	Reclassify	Reclassify		
STAR	Healthy Watersheds	Reclassify	Reclassify		
LGAC	Healthy Watersheds	Reclassify	Reclassify		
SAC	Healthy Watersheds	Reclassify	Reclassify	agree with outcome lead	n/a
STAC	Healthy Watersheds	Reclassify	Update		

HEALTHY WATERSHEDS - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference				
Outcome Disposition	Count (total)	Average (total)	Count (voting)	Count (non-voting)
Consolidate	0	0.00%	0	0
Reclassify	18	62.07%	8	10
Remove	1	3.45%	0	1
Replace	1	3.45%	1	0
Update	2	6.90%	0	2
Stand-Aside	5	17.24%	0	5
Select Disposition	2	6.90%	0	2




<b>SUM</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>20</b>
------------	-----------	----------------	----------	-----------

## HEALTHY WATERSHEDS - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference



## HEALTHY WATERSHEDS - Disposition Preference - Count (voting) and Count (non-voting)



<b>FISH HABITAT</b>					
<b>Org</b>	<b>Outcome (Instruction)</b>	<b>GIT Recommendation</b>	<b>Outcome Disposition</b>	<b>Rationale for Outcome Disposition</b>	<b>Follow-Up Questions</b>
DC	Fish Habitat	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>	DC supports the GIT's disposition.	
DE	Fish Habitat	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>	DE agrees with recommendation.	
MD	Fish Habitat	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>	Agree with the recommendation and would support having separately focused tidal and nontidal workgroups, either as two outputs under one Outcome or as two Outcomes.	
NY	Fish Habitat	<b>Update</b>	<b>Stand-Aside</b>	NY does not participate in this outcome	
PA	Fish Habitat	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>	Agree to Update. If Nontidal Fish Habitat is accepted as a Novel Outcome, then the title of Fish Habitat should be specific to Tidal.	
VA	Fish Habitat	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>	Our disposition at this time is to update or consider a more holistic replacement. The Fish Habitat Action Team has published and maintained literature reviews, information inventories, and summaries pertaining to fish habitat that have been valuable to Virginia.	
WV	Fish Habitat	<b>Update</b>	<b>Stand-Aside</b>		
CBC	Fish Habitat	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>	With continued conversation about how to structure and distinguish our nontidal fish and habitat outcomes.	
EPA	Fish Habitat	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>	EPA recommends pursuing a single fish habitat outcome with separate tidal and non-tidal outputs.	
DOD	Fish Habitat	<b>Update</b>	<b>Stand-Aside</b>		

DHS	Fish Habitat	Update	Select Disposition		
DOT	Fish Habitat	Update	Select Disposition		
NRCS	Fish Habitat	Update	Stand-Aside		
USFS	Fish Habitat	Update	Stand-Aside		
ACE	Fish Habitat	Update	Stand-Aside		
NOAA	Fish Habitat	Update	Update		
FWS	Fish Habitat	Update	Update	We defer to the technical experts in the WORKgroup	NA
NPS	Fish Habitat	Update	Stand-Aside	NPS does not take a position on this outcome	
USGS	Fish Habitat	Update	Update		
GIT 1	Fish Habitat	Update	Update		
GIT 2	Fish Habitat	Update	Update		
GIT 3	Fish Habitat	Update	Stand-Aside		
GIT 4	Fish Habitat	Update	Update	Agree with GIT recommendation	
GIT 5	Fish Habitat	Update	Stand-Aside		
GIT 6	Fish Habitat	Update	Update		
STAR	Fish Habitat	Update	Update		
LGAC	Fish Habitat	Update	Update		
SAC	Fish Habitat	Update	Update	agree with GIT; this outcome needs to include freshwater habitat for engagement of headwater states	n/a

STAC	Fish Habitat	Update	Update		
------	--------------	--------	--------	--	--


FISH HABITAT - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference				
Outcome Disposition	Count (total)	Average (total)	Count (voting)	Count (non-voting)
Consolidate	0	0.00%	0	0
Reclassify	0	0.00%	0	0
Remove	0	0.00%	0	0
Replace	0	0.00%	0	0
Update	19	65.52%	7	12
Stand-Aside	8	27.59%	2	6
Select Disposition	2	6.90%	0	2
SUM	29	100.00%	9	20

## FISH HABITAT- Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference


Select Disposition  
6.9%

Stand-Aside  
27.6%

Update  
65.5%



## FISH HABITAT - Disposition Preference - Count (voting) and Count (non-voting)




<b>FORAGE FISH</b>					
<b>Org</b>	<b>Outcome (Instruction)</b>	<b>GIT Recommendation</b>	<b>Outcome Disposition</b>	<b>Rationale for Outcome Disposition</b>	<b>Follow-Up Questions</b>
DC	Forage Fish	Reclassify	Stand-Aside	DC stands aside for this Outcome.	
DE	Forage Fish	Reclassify	Stand-Aside	DE is not signed on for this outcome.	
MD	Forage Fish	Reclassify	Reclassify	Agree with the recommendation to reclassify an output under Fish Habitat Outcome.	
NY	Forage Fish	Reclassify	Stand-Aside	NY does not participate in this outcome	
PA	Forage Fish	Reclassify	Reclassify	Agree to Reclassify.	
VA	Forage Fish	Reclassify	Reclassify	In Virginia, there is work being done in this area that will continue, but we do not believe the added value is there to continue this as a standalone outcome.	
WV	Forage Fish	Reclassify	Stand-Aside		
CBC	Forage Fish	Reclassify	Reclassify	Agree with the recommendation to reclassify as an indicator of fish habitat.	
EPA	Forage Fish	Reclassify	Reclassify	EPA supports the GIT's recommendation.	
DOD	Forage Fish	Reclassify	Reclassify		
DHS	Forage Fish	Reclassify	Select Disposition		
DOT	Forage Fish	Reclassify	Select Disposition		
NRCS	Forage Fish	Reclassify	Reclassify		




USFS	Forage Fish	Reclassify	Stand-Aside		
ACE	Forage Fish	Reclassify	Stand-Aside		
NOAA	Forage Fish	Reclassify	Reclassify		
FWS	Forage Fish	Reclassify	Reclassify	We defer to the technical experts in the Workgroup	NA
NPS	Forage Fish	Reclassify	Stand-Aside	NPS does not take a position on this outcome	
USGS	Forage Fish	Reclassify	Reclassify		
GIT 1	Forage Fish	Reclassify	Reclassify	Forage will be a key output under a tidal fish habitat outcome	
GIT 2	Forage Fish	Reclassify	Reclassify		
GIT 3	Forage Fish	Reclassify	Stand-Aside		
GIT 4	Forage Fish	Reclassify	Reclassify	Agree with GIT recommendation	
GIT 5	Forage Fish	Reclassify	Stand-Aside		
GIT 6	Forage Fish	Reclassify	Reclassify		
STAR	Forage Fish	Reclassify	Reclassify		
LGAC	Forage Fish	Reclassify	Reclassify		
SAC	Forage Fish	Reclassify	Reclassify	support moving under Fish Habitat	n/a
STAC	Forage Fish	Reclassify	Update		

FORAGE FISH - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference				
Outcome Disposition	Count (total)	Average (total)	Count (voting)	Count (non-voting)
Consolidate	0	0.00%	0	0
Reclassify	17	58.62%	5	12
Remove	0	0.00%	0	0
Replace	0	0.00%	0	0
Update	1	3.45%	0	1
Stand-Aside	9	31.03%	4	5
Select Disposition	2	6.90%	0	2
SUM	29	100.00%	9	20

## FORAGE FISH - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference



## FORAGE FISHT - Disposition Preference - Voting & Non-Voting Members




<b>BROOK TROUT</b>					
<b>Org</b>	<b>Outcome (Instruction)</b>	<b>GIT Recommendation</b>	<b>Outcome Disposition</b>	<b>Rationale for Outcome Disposition</b>	<b>Follow-Up Questions</b>
DC	Brook Trout	Update	Update	DC supports the GIT's disposition.	
DE	Brook Trout	Update	Stand-Aside	DE is not signed on for this outcome.	
MD	Brook Trout	Update	Update	Agree with the recommendation.	
NY	Brook Trout	Update	Update	Agree with the recommendations	
PA	Brook Trout	Update	Reclassify	Brook Trout should be reclassified as an output under the Nontidal Fish Habitat Novel Outcome.	
VA	Brook Trout	Update	Update	We are open to update, reclassify, or consolidate, depending on how this best fits with other related outcomes. Additional time may be needed to work out those details.	
WV	Brook Trout	Update	Stand-Aside		
CBC	Brook Trout	Update	Update	With continued conversation about how to structure and distinguish our nontidal fish and habitat outcomes.	
EPA	Brook Trout	Update	Stand-Aside	EPA would prefer if Brook Trout were consolidated with another outcome or reclassified as an output or indicator of another outcome, but recognizing the importance of brook trout in headwater regions, chooses to stand aside and not block the consensus of the group.	What is the workload and reporting requirement associated with this?
DOD	Brook Trout	Update	Update		

DHS	Brook Trout	Update	Select Disposition		
DOT	Brook Trout	Update	Select Disposition		
NRCS	Brook Trout	Update	Stand-Aside		
USFS	Brook Trout	Update	Update	Support the recommendation of the workgroup and see this outcome as being important for increasing the relevance of the Agreement to the public. Also agree with proposed expanded focus to address resiliency and drive conservatin/restoration of upland forests in coldwater watersheds	
ACE	Brook Trout	Update	Stand-Aside		
NOAA	Brook Trout	Update	Stand-Aside		
FWS	Brook Trout	Update	Update	We defer to the technical experts in the WOrkgroup	NA
NPS	Brook Trout	Update	Stand-Aside	NPS does not take a position on this outcome	
USGS	Brook Trout	Update	Update		
GIT 1	Brook Trout	Update	Stand-Aside		
GIT 2	Brook Trout	Update	Update		
GIT 3	Brook Trout	Update	Update	Brook trout serve as a connection to water quality in the headwater states.	
GIT 4	Brook Trout	Update	Update	Agree with GIT recommendation	
GIT 5	Brook Trout	Update	Stand-Aside		
GIT 6	Brook Trout	Update	Update		

STAR	Brook Trout	Update	Update		
LGAC	Brook Trout	Update	Update		
SAC	Brook Trout	Update	Update	appreciate including abundance as a component	n/a
STAC	Brook Trout	Update	Update		


BROOK TROUT - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference				
Outcome Disposition	Count (total)	Average (total)	Count (voting)	Count (non-voting)
Consolidate	0	0.00%	0	0
Reclassify	1	3.45%	1	0
Remove	0	0.00%	0	0
Replace	0	0.00%	0	0
Update	17	58.62%	5	12
Stand-Aside	9	31.03%	3	6
Select Disposition	2	6.90%	0	2
SUM	29	100.00%	9	20

## BROOK TROUT- Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference





## BROOK TROUT - Disposition Preference - Count (voting) and Count (non-voting)



STREAM HEALTH					
Org	Outcome (Instruction)	GIT Recommendation	Outcome Disposition	Rationale for Outcome Disposition	Follow-Up Questions
DC	Stream Health	Update	Update	DC supports the GIT's disposition.	For DC, the Healthy Watersheds Outcome largely overlaps with the Stream Health Outcome. Rather than maintaining them as separate Outcomes with distinct activities, Healthy Watersheds could be integrated into Stream Health, ensuring that all headwater, riparian, and stream restoration efforts are addressed under a single outcome.
DE	Stream Health	Update	Update	DE agrees with recommendation.	
MD	Stream Health	Update	Update	Agree with the recommendation. Stream Health is uniquely focused on restoring degraded non-tidal stream habitat and water quality to achieve ecological uplift, and it would be inappropriate to fold it under other Outcomes that exclusively focus on aquatic life or land use activities. Besides this, everyone in the watershed is just a few minutes from one of the more than 100,000 streams and rivers that drain into the Bay - this is one of the most tangible Outcomes we have toward fulfilling the EC Charge to address water quality and living resources	

				throughout the watershed and engage all communities as active stewards.	
NY	Stream Health	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>	Agree with the recommendations	
PA	Stream Health	<b>Update</b>	<b>Replace</b>	<p>Stream Health should be replaced with the Nontidal Fish Habitat Novel Outcome. According to the Stream Health Two-Pager, the recommendation for the Outcome update is as follows: "The Stream Health workgroup (SHWG) recommends updating the outcome to reflect a more holistic approach to improving ecological integrity of stream systems and stream corridors based on sound science, coupled with land management, planning, and protection to improve and sustain stream health." The recommended outcome for the Nontidal Fish Habitat Novel Outcome is as follows: "Improve fish habitat condition through the understanding of land use and habitat function under changing conditions. Maintain fish habitat through focused water quality, conservation and restoration improvements informed by a synthesis of living resource data and habitat assessments." These two are very similar and we recommend that the</p>	


				Stream Health Outcome is replaced with the Tidal Fish Habitat Novel Outcome.	
VA	Stream Health	Update	Consolidate	We are struggling to identify the value that a Stream Health Outcome provides to support our work as a jurisdiction. Stream restoration work is incredibly important in Virginia, but the Outcome language is overly broad.	
WV	Stream Health	Update	Stand-Aside		
CBC	Stream Health	Update	Update	With continued conversation about how to structure and distinguish our nontidal fish and habitat outcomes.	
EPA	Stream Health	Update	Update	EPA supports the GIT's recommendation.	
DOD	Stream Health	Update	Update		
DHS	Stream Health	Update	Select Disposition		
DOT	Stream Health	Update	Select Disposition		
NRCS	Stream Health	Update	Stand-Aside		
USFS	Stream Health	Update	Update	Support the recommendation of the workgroup and see the value of continuing this work to better understand	

				and address stressors of stream ecosystem health (beyond just water quality) and to expand and have a more holistic focus	
ACE	Stream Health	Update	Stand-Aside		
NOAA	Stream Health	Update	Stand-Aside		
FWS	Stream Health	Update	Update	We defer to the technical experts in the WORKgroup	NA
NPS	Stream Health	Update	Update		
USGS	Stream Health	Update	Update		
GIT 1	Stream Health	Update	Stand-Aside		
GIT 2	Stream Health	Update	Update		
GIT 3	Stream Health	Update	Update	I think this is an outcome that resonates more with the public. To me the WIP outcomes focus on restoration and fixing what is impaired. The partnership needs to include a focus on protection for those water bodies that are not impaired and contribute to sustaining water bodies that meeting/attain water quality standards. We need the healthy streams and to	

				restore impaired streams to achieve the WIP outcome.	
GIT 4	Stream Health	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>	Agree with GIT recommendation	Integrate Healthy Watersheds and Land Use Methods and Metrics outputs into the management strategy for this outcome.
GIT 5	Stream Health	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>		
GIT 6	Stream Health	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>		
STAR	Stream Health	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>		
LGAC	Stream Health	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>		
SAC	Stream Health	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>	strong connection to watershed health	n/a
STAC	Stream Health	<b>Update</b>	<b>Update</b>		


STREAM HEALTH - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference				
Outcome Disposition	Count (total)	Average (total)	Count (voting)	Count (non-voting)
Consolidate	1	3.45%	1	0
Reclassify	0	0.00%	0	0
Remove	0	0.00%	0	0
Replace	1	3.45%	1	0
Update	20	68.97%	6	14
Stand-Aside	5	17.24%	1	4
Select Disposition	2	6.90%	0	2
SUM	29	100.00%	9	20

## STREAM HEALTH - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference





## STREAM HEALTH - Disposition Preference - Count (voting) and Count (non-voting)




FISH PASSAGE					
Org	Outcome (Instruction)	GIT Recommendation	Outcome Disposition	Rationale for Outcome Disposition	Follow-Up Questions
DC	Fish Passage	Update	Update	DC supports the GIT's disposition.	
DE	Fish Passage	Update	Stand-Aside	DE is not signed on for this outcome.	
MD	Fish Passage	Update	Update	Agree with the recommendation.	
NY	Fish Passage	Update	Update	Agree with the recommendations	
PA	Fish Passage	Update	Reclassify	Fish Passage should be Reclassified as an output under the Nontidal Fish Habitat Novel Outcome.	
VA	Fish Passage	Update	Update	We are open to update, reclassify, or consolidate, depending on how this best fits with other related outcomes. Additional time may be needed to work out those details.	
WV	Fish Passage	Update	Stand-Aside		
CBC	Fish Passage	Update	Update	With continued conversation about how to structure and distinguish our nontidal fish and habitat outcomes.	
EPA	Fish Passage	Update	Update	EPA supports the GIT's recommendation.	
DOD	Fish Passage	Update	Update		
DHS	Fish Passage	Update	Select Disposition		
DOT	Fish Passage	Update	Select Disposition		
NRCS	Fish Passage	Update	Update		

USFS	Fish Passage	Update	Update	Support the recommendation of the workgroup and the expanded scope to include non-physical barriers, including thermal barriers, which were highlighted as an important issue in the Rising Water Temperatures STAC report	
ACE	Fish Passage	Update	Stand-Aside		
NOAA	Fish Passage	Update	Update		
FWS	Fish Passage	Update	Update	We defer to the technical experts in the WOrkgroup	NA
NPS	Fish Passage	Update	Stand-Aside	NPS does not take a position on this outcome	
USGS	Fish Passage	Update	Update		
GIT 1	Fish Passage	Update	Stand-Aside		
GIT 2	Fish Passage	Update	Update		
GIT 3	Fish Passage	Update	Update	agree with the GIT recommendations; are encouraged how the update suggestions will broaden potentially the states participating in this outcome.	
GIT 4	Fish Passage	Update	Update	Agree with GIT recommendation	
GIT 5	Fish Passage	Update	Stand-Aside		
GIT 6	Fish Passage	Update	Update		
STAR	Fish Passage	Update	Update		
LGAC	Fish Passage	Update	Update		
SAC	Fish Passage	Update	Update	appreciate inclusion of thermal and chemical barriers	n/a
STAC	Fish Passage	Update	Update		

FISH PASSAGE - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference				
Outcome Disposition	Count (total)	Average (total)	Count (voting)	Count (non-voting)
Consolidate	0	0.00%	0	0
Reclassify	1	3.45%	1	0
Remove	0	0.00%	0	0
Replace	0	0.00%	0	0
Update	20	68.97%	6	14
Stand-Aside	6	20.69%	2	4
Select Disposition	2	6.90%	0	2
SUM	29	100.00%	9	20

## FISH PASSAGE - Full MB Outcome Disposition Preference



## FISH PASSAGE - Disposition Preference - Count (voting) and Count (non-voting)

