

**Stakeholders' Advisory Committee Annual Recommendations to the Executive Council**  
**Historical Library 2008-2024**  
***Working Draft as of 12/8/24***

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Result</b>
<b>Environmental Education (EE)</b>	<b>2016-</b> new EE Directive; MOU with US Dept of ED; US Dept of Ed on Executive Order Federal Leadership Team; biannual leadership summit; ensure staffing and funding; host a EE summit with colleges; states tap into ESSA funding; advocate for federal funds for ESSA, B-WET, and EPA EE programs	EE Directive was put on hold during the 2017 EC meeting because the VA Administration wanted to focus solely on the importance of the Chesapeake Bay Program in light of the President's proposal to eliminate federal funding
	<b>2015-</b> CBP sign an MOU with US Dept of Ed	
	<b>2014-</b> include an Environmental Literacy goal in the new Watershed Agreement so every student has one MWEE at each school level	2014 Watershed Agreement includes an Environmental Literacy Planning, Student watershed experience, and Sustainable Schools goals
	<b>2012-</b> CBP sign an MOU with US Dept of Ed and tap into federal education grants; create two-year milestones for environmental literacy; endorse NOAA's Mid-Atlantic Elementary and Secondary Environmental Literacy Strategy	NOAA's EE strategy was endorsed by CBP
	<b>2010-</b> US Dept of Ed on Federal Leadership Committee	
	<b>2009-</b> support the No Child Left Inside Act, create State environmental literacy programs	

<p><b>Environmental Education Update:</b></p>	<p>In October 2016 Governor McAuliffe disbanded the VA Office of Environmental Education and laid off its staff. Indications are the EE Directive will move forward for Executive Council signature during the 2018 annual meeting.</p> <p>In 2015, 32 out of 140 (23%) local education agencies that responded to a Chesapeake Bay Program survey self-identified as well-prepared to put a comprehensive and systemic approach to environmental literacy in place. Local education agencies is a term that refers to school districts that operate public elementary, middle and high schools. 53% of the respondents are in MD; 44% are in VA, and 3% (one agency) is in PA.</p> <p><b>2018:</b> Proposed Executive Council <b>Directive for Environmental Literacy</b> that did not move forward. For those jurisdictions that are able to, recommend including elements of <b>workforce development and training</b> to support the next generation of stewards with options <b>for living wage environmental careers</b>. For those jurisdictions that do not yet have the capacity to pursue all the actions we encourage <b>participating in the conferencing</b> of high-level leaders every two years to discuss progress of the <i>Watershed Agreement</i> Environmental Educational goal and outcomes.</p> <p><b>2019: Expand and support programs and incentives</b> to advance the important objectives of environmental education and green workforce development. <b>Underserved areas, inner city and rural schools, and communities</b> receive increased attention as a means of broadening environmental experiential opportunities</p>	
<p><b>Oysters</b></p>	<p><b>2016-</b> caution on crediting for TMDL and trading; support federal/state programs for native oyster restoration</p>	<p>Expert Panel recommended estimates of pollution reduction for oyster tissue as BMPs for in-water restoration; jurisdictions must decide how/if to implement</p>
<p><b>Update:</b></p>	<p><b>2008-</b> use the precautionary principle when considering the introduction of non-native oyster species</p>	<p>Non-native oysters were not used for oyster restoration</p>
<p>In spring 2018 the Expert Panel will issue the report on estimates for pollution reduction from harvested oyster shells.</p>		

Engaging Locals	EPA Office of General Counsel issued its legal opinion supporting the use of oysters as in-water pollution reduction practices for nitrogen and phosphorus.	
	2016- communicate economic, environmental and quality of life benefits of locally restored waters; develop communication strategies	
	2015- allocate funding for local programs for Chesapeake Bay Agreement; develop local report cards; develop local community visions; incorporate local action into Agreement Management Strategy Workplans	Local actions added to the Agreement Work Plan templates developed by the Goal Implementation Teams
	2014- demonstrates local benefits and the value of healthy local natural resources in the Agreement Management Strategies	
	2007- message the Tributary Strategies so they relay local benefits of good land use decisions	
	Update CAC has been following the jurisdictions' plans for developing the Phase 3 TMDL Watershed Implementation Plans (WIPs). Nov 2017 presentation from DC; Feb 2018 presentation from MD.	
	2024: [River Basin Strategies to Engage Locals] Jurisdictions approach their next phase of Watershed Implementation Plans to support <b>locally driven river basin strategies</b> to delist a target number of rivers by a future date with interim milestones along the way. This approach should include initiatives to <b>engage</b> communities, officials, watershed and conservation groups, land trusts, and local service providers to <b>incentivize and allocate funds</b> for the protection of tributaries with an emphasis on <b>existing forests and wetlands</b> .	
Accountability and Transparency	2015- fund verification of implementation practices; create a task force to look for cost savings; review recommendations for independent verification of BMPs	

		<b>2014-</b> continue to work toward strengthening BMP verification and follow the protocols that afford the jurisdictions defensible credit in the Chesapeake Bay computer model; provide adequate staff and funding towards the commitments required to meet the goals and outcomes and outline the anticipated funding that will be used to meet outcomes	The Bay Program completed their BMP verification protocols that States are required to meet in order to get credit for BMPs in the Bay Model
		<b>2013-</b> better verification of BMPs reported to the Bay Model	
		<b>2010-</b> third party verification of BMPs; tougher enforcement of regulation; increase regulatory oversight	
	<b>Update:</b>	In early 2018 States are supposed to respond to addressing needs EPA identified in their approved verification plans and outline their strategy for implementation of the verification plans. By the end of Dec 2018 state practices submitted for nutrient and sediment credit reduction in the Bay Model must be in compliance with the BMP verification protocols	
<b>Verification of BMPs</b>		<p><b>2018:</b> Programmatic infrastructure and financial support for meaningful BMP <b>verification as a part of implementation of Phase 3 WIPs</b>, particularly in accounting for growth and land use changes.</p> <p><b>2019:</b> Jurisdictions should use <b>satellite imagery</b> to help with verification of practices.</p>	
<b>Regulatory Enforcement</b>		<b>2020:</b> prioritize <b>equitable enforcement of regulations</b> in an effort to not lose ground on water quality progress. Example: communities with Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems ( <b>MS4</b> ) regulations could experience significant financial restraints on future implementation of	

	<p>their permits, but compliance support will prevent backsliding.</p>	
	<p><b>2022: Hire agency staff to enforce existing regulations, target priority practices with co-benefits, and provide technical assistance</b> for implementation. Confirm the <b>credibility</b> of the Chesapeake Bay Program with <b>transparent accountability</b> to the <i>Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement</i> and steadfast reliance on state and federal environmental authorities.</p>	<p>2022: EPA appreciates the important role of enforcement to ensure compliance with environmental laws and regulations. EPA has increased its presence in the field, as announced by Regional Administrator Adam Ortiz, in April 2022 and again in November 2022. Furthermore, EPA remains committed to supporting all Chesapeake Bay restoration activities—continuing to provide substantial funding and technical assistance, tracking and reporting progress, and coordinating and facilitating partnership efforts. Working across seven jurisdictions, multiple federal agencies, many local governments and non-government organizations, EPA completes its work based on best judgement for budget, staffing allocations and other additional priorities as resources allow. In addition, EPA determines, based on</p>

		best judgement across several programs, which actions to take regarding the TMDL.
<b>Federal Funding</b>	<b>2017-</b> Fully fund the EPA Chesapeake Bay Program and other federal agencies in response to the Trump Administration budget proposal to eliminate or drastically cut federal funding	EPA Chesapeake Bay Program received level funding after Congress issued a Continuing Resolution
	<b>2015-</b> Take Advantage of untapped federal funding like: Rivers of the Chesapeake; POWER Plus; Army Corps Chesapeake restoration funding	Governors sent a joint letter to Congress for Rivers of the Chesapeake FY17 funding
	<b>2014-</b> take full advantage of federal funding that may be available for meeting the goals	
	<b>2011-</b> concern over cuts to EPA's Clean Water Revolving Fund, NOAA, NPS, Dept of Ag, ACOE, and US FWS- how will federal agencies meet the Executive Order?	
	<b>2010-</b> US Dept of Transportation in the Executive Order Federal Leadership Committee to get assess to Transportation Enhancement program funds and increase public access to waterways; FERC to reduce impacts from transmission power lines	
	<b>2009-</b> Do No Harm with Stimulus Funding	
<b>Governance</b>	<b>2013-</b> Don't allow jurisdictions to Opt-Out of the goals in the new Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement	Jurisdictions can decide where they prioritize their resources, but VA and MD indicated they would participate in all of the Agreement Goals
	<b>Side Note:</b> In 2008 CAC told the PSC that "consensus was more important in the science and goal setting phases of the Program, but now that we are in the implementation phase	

	<p>consensus as an operational procedure is less important than achieving measurable results. If some jurisdictions are willing to move forward on an initiative then they should not wait for consensus to do so.”</p> <p>In 2014 during the drafting of the CBP Governance Document, CAC told the PSC CAC does not support the use of “super-majority” votes in workgroups and Goal Implementation Teams and that “if a workgroup or GIT is unable to reach consensus (the traditional operating procedure for the Bay Program, which CAC fully supports) then you as the PSC should be notified and asked to help resolve the decision through a consensus process.” ----As a result the workgroups and GITs can no longer vote, but must reach consensus.</p> <p>The Water Quality GIT has requested a change in the Governance Document to reinstitute the voting privileges of the GITs and workgroups. This will be addressed by the Partnering and Leadership GIT in the coming months.</p>	
<b>Toxic Contaminants</b>	<b>2013-</b> include a Toxics Goal in the Agreement	Toxic Contaminants Goal with Research and Policy/Prevention Outcomes
<b>Climate Change</b>	<b>2013-</b> The Agreement should recognize the need to adapt for climate and the Management Strategies should so how implementation will be addressed for changing conditions	Climate Resiliency Goal with a Monitoring and Assessment Outcome
<b>Update:</b>	<p>In November 2017 the PSC recognized that climate change is increasing the frequency of storms and precipitation which delivers more nutrients and sediment from stormwater runoff. Current estimates show that by 2025 an additional 9 million additional pounds of nitrogen and 385,000 pounds of phosphorus per year will be reaching the Bay.</p> <p>The States’ Phase 3 WIPs will describe broad approaches for addressing the additional climate change</p>	

	<p>pollution, but will not receive numeric targets until 2021. At this point, the climate change reduction loads will not have to be implemented by 2025.</p>	
	<p><b>2021:</b> infrastructure funds that advance the commitments outlined in the <i>Collective Action for Climate Change Directive</i>- Ensure [jurisdictions'] policies are aligned with the Partnership's climate goals and to assess the capacity of their agencies to deliver climate resilient programs.</p>	<p>The Management Board convened a planning group of jurisdiction and federal agency representatives to develop a partnership-wide plan for implementing the Directive. This planning group is working to understand where jurisdiction climate activities align with the commitments outlined in the Directive, identifying priority areas for collaborative action, and developing a workplan to guide partnership activities.</p> <p>The CBP Federal Office Directors (FOD) will soon release a statement outlining specific climate commitments from their agencies and collective opportunities to carry out the four major goals of the Directive.</p> <p>Each Goal Implementation Team has been asked to address climate resiliency concerns through their</p>



		updated logic and action plans as part of the CBP's Strategy Review System (SRS).
<b>Conowingo Dam</b>	<b>2013-</b> Since it will not be in the new Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement, how will the sediment capacity behind the Dam be addressed?	Included in the Bay TMDL Appendix for addressing in the 2017 Midpoint Assessment and may be incorporated in the Phase III WIPs
	<b>2012-</b> consider the cost of inaction to addressing the sediment build-up behind the dam	
	<b>2010-</b> include FERC on the Executive Order Federal Leadership Committee to talk about their role in the impacts of the dam; concern with potential scouring of sediment from large storm events	
	<b>2009-</b> address the sediment build-up behind the Dam	
	<p><b>Update:</b> During the 2017 Midpoint Assessment the Dam was found to be filled with sediment sooner than predicted when the TMDL was created in 2010. Approximately 6 million additional pounds of nitrogen and 260,000 additional pounds of phosphorus a year are reaching the Bay.</p> <p>December 2017 the PSC agreed that the Bay jurisdictions will contribute a portion of their federal funding to fund and implement pollution control to reduce or offset the additional loads from the Dam. There will be a separate Conowingo Dam WIP. MD will seek contributions from Dam owner, Exelon. Additionally, MD has begun a pilot project to explore innovative dredging options.</p>	

<b>Citizen Engagement/ Public Access to Waterways</b>	<b>2012-</b> Increase Public Access to Bay and Rivers	The 2014 Watershed Agreement includes a goal for adding 300 new public access sites
	<b>2010-</b> identify new public access sites	
	<b>2009-</b> protect and increase public access sites, especially in underserved communities	
	<b>Update</b> Between 2010 and 2016, 132 public access sites were opened to the public. This marks a 44% achievement of the goal to add 300 new access sites to the watershed and brings the total number of access sites in the region to 1,271.	
<b>Land Conservation</b>	<b>2014-</b> support the federal designation of the Chesapeake Bay Watershed as a high priority landscape in the Collaborative Landscape Conservation Initiative	
	<b>2012-</b> provide funding for land conservation and support the Land and Water Conservation Fund	
	<b>2008-</b> States must address land conversion and the Sprawl Goal in <i>2000 Agreement (C2K)</i>	
	<b>Update:</b> By 2025, the Bay Program models predict increased growth in the amount of people, farm animals, and developed land, along with the loss of forests will result in an additional 4 million pounds of nitrogen and 154,000 pounds of phosphorus entering the Bay.  Forecasts of growth will be incorporated into the nutrient reduction goals given to the states for them to address in their Phase 3 WIPs. This may allow for future credit to states for protecting lands like forests from development.	

<b>Land Use: Forests, Buffers and Wetlands</b>	<p><b>2018: (1)</b> Build capacity in the Phase 3 WIPs and two-year milestones to expand forest buffers and wetlands.</p> <p><b>(2)</b> Include technical assistance and education on multi-functional forest buffers like nut and fruit trees as riparian production crops on agricultural lands</p> <p><b>(3)</b> Meet with the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture to encourage the prioritization of buffer and wetland practices to advance water quality goals</p> <p><b>(4)</b> Communicate the co-benefits of buffers and wetlands, including protecting drinking water sources and flood mitigation</p> <p><b>(5)</b> Adjust state funding programs to support forest buffers on non-agricultural lands</p> <p><b>(6)</b> Simplify the process for landowners to apply for Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP), Wetlands Reserve Easement (WRE), and other conservation practices.</p>	
	<p><b>2019:</b> A lack of coordination and prioritization among the federal agencies that provide technical assistance to farmers has stalled progress on forested buffers Available funds in the Farm Bill- EC to engage with the Sec. of Agriculture and other USDA officials to provide leadership on this issue.</p>	
	<p><b>2023: (1)</b> PSC to approve actionable items for each jurisdiction to accelerate the implementation of the Forest Buffer and Wetlands Actions Plans to close the progress gaps for water quality restoration. They should identify</p>	<p>- The Chesapeake Bay Program partnership is committed to focusing on wetlands and riparian forest</p>

<p><b>Land Use: Forests, Buffers and Wetlands continued</b></p>	<p><b>champions</b> in each jurisdiction responsible for leading the effort, and should <b>outline short and longer-term funding needs</b>, establishing ambitious yet reasonable expectations of progress by 2025.</p> <p><b>(2)</b> Sustain funding for the high-resolution land-use and land-change data and analysis, so local governments can rely on complete assessments of existing and trending losses of tree canopy and wetlands for land-use decision-making</p> <p><b>(3)</b> Commit to preserving forests and wetlands by enhancing their conservation programs</p>	<p>buffer restoration as top priorities for the program. Over the next six months, the Management Board will identify members of the Principals' Staff Committee who will serve as partnership champions for wetlands, riparian forest buffers, and tree canopy.</p> <p>- Multiple jurisdictions are working to develop or expand flexible riparian forest buffer programs to accelerate buffer planting in the watershed. Additional, dedicated sources of funding could further accelerate implementation through these programs.</p> <p>- In 2023, the EPA and the U.S. Forest Service provided several grants funded by the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act and the Inflation Reduction Act to advance efforts to restore wetlands, forest buffers, and urban tree canopy</p>
<p><b>Land Use: Solar Development</b></p>	<p><b>2022:</b> Develop a watershed-wide approach to protecting water quality and farms amidst large solar arrays</p>	<p>No CBP Action, Waiting on STAC report (STAC meeting was on April 6-7, 2023)</p>

<b>Acid Mine Drainage</b>	<b>2015-</b> via POWER Plus, Advocate in Congress to approve the funding for acid mine drainage remediation	
	<b>2012-</b> Bay Program sign an MOU with Bureau of Land Management and Office of Surface Mining	
<b>Water Quality Trading</b>	<b>2012-</b> Transparency, Verification and Public Involvement in Jurisdictions' trading programs; preserve local water quality	
	<b>Update:</b> In Aug 2017 EPA released 'Discussion Paper: Considerations for Interstate Trading and Offsets in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed' to outline the coordination required among the different state water quality trading programs to allow for intra-basin and/or multi-jurisdiction trading.	
<b>TMDL and Water Quality</b>	<b>2016-</b> articulate what local planning goals in the Phase III WIPs mean; include soil and water conservation districts in Phase III WIP development; contact new Presidential Administration early to support NRCS and FSA programs	
	<b>2012-</b> Phase II WIPs should be enforceable and enforced; EC should regularly report on progress	
	<b>2011-</b> enforceable, transparent reporting, critical to ensure voluntary nonpoint sources are doing their part	
	<b>2010-</b> strong reasonable assurance in the Phase I WIPs	
	<b>2009-</b> Create 2 Year Milestones to measure progress, strong reasonable assurance in the Bay TMDL	In 2012, the jurisdictions submitted their first set of 2-Year Milestones to EPA for review as a part of the TMDL Accountability Framework
	<b>2008-</b> Create 2 Year Goals in the Tributary Strategies to measure progress, target resources and develop consequences through enhanced enforcement	
	<b>Update:</b> In 2013 federal Supreme Court ruling upheld the legality of the TMDL.	

	States are developing their Phase 3 WIPs following the 2017 Midpoint Assessment.	
WIP Implementation	<b>2018:</b> Integrate <i>Watershed Agreement</i> outcomes into the water quality restoration plans as a way to <b>incentivize practices that offer corollary ecological benefits</b> and to encourage meaningful participation in <b>local planning targets</b> supporting local economies and communities	
	<p><b>2021: 2025 Bay TMDL - Federal Funding</b> EPA and other federal agencies <b>make available the Bay-related funds</b> as quickly as possible, especially given the 2025 TMDL deadline</p> <p>Expedite <b>implementation of the prioritized practices that deliver co-benefits</b> for water quality, healthy habitats, and living resources in a changing climate</p> <p>Collaboratively develop a framework that outlines how jurisdictions anticipate their use of the remaining <b>American Rescue Plan Acts (ARPA) funds</b> and the new <b>infrastructure funds</b> to maximize these programs' impact.</p>	<b>2021:</b> We recognize the urgency to make Bay related funding provided through the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) available as quickly as possible to support activities that advance the goals of the Watershed Agreement and the TMDL. We commit to exploring strategies and tools, such as the Watershed Data Dashboard and the current Chesapeake Assessment Scenario Tool, that could be used to help expedite implementation of projects that generate multiple ecosystem and community resilience benefits.
	<b>2024:</b> We strongly encourage the Bay Program to commit, by the end of 2025, to a new deadline for the implementation of the existing Watershed Implementation Plans as a part of the revision of the <i>Watershed Agreement</i>	

<b>Independent Evaluation</b>	<b>2011-</b> create a permanent function in the CBP; Clean Water Act 319 grant funds to match state funds for contracting third party verifications and technical support	
	<b>2009-</b> create a permanent independent evaluator	2009 The PSC approved the funding of a contract for independent evaluation. EPA and Jurisdictions funded NAS to conduct a two year study at \$500,000
	<b>2008-</b> create a permanent evaluation function to the CBP that is truly independent and focus on impediments to implementing the Tributary Strategies	The 2008 CBP Reorganization included a box as a placeholder on the new organizational structure labeled Independent Evaluator
	<b>Update</b>	2014 Chesapeake Bay Accountability and Recovery Act called for the creation of an independent evaluator to be appointed by the EPA Administrator. No money was allocated for this function. The 2016 PSC decided to delay recommending evaluator options to EPA since the drafters of the legislation did not intend to divert funding from implementation for evaluation. <i>Status to date: Unknown, no action.</i>
<b>Marcellus Shale Natural Gas Drilling</b>	<b>2011-</b> develop new regulations and transparency for water quality and human health impacts; enforce permits and setbacks from waterways, wetlands and private wells	
	<b>2010-</b> Do No Harm on drinking water and local water quality	
	<b>2008-</b> concern about negative water quality, quantity and drinking water impacts of hydrofrack drilling, policy makers should look comprehensively at impacts on local communities, stressed infrastructure and downstream	
<b>Leadership</b>	<b>2010-</b> EPA should lead by example in reducing stormwater in DC since 30% of land is federally owned	

<b>Human Health</b>	<b>2009-</b> consider human health impacts of water quality decisions, especially toxins and endocrine disruptors	
<b>Broader Urban Nonpoint Source Pollution</b>	<b>2009-</b> new regulations and legislation	
	<b>2024:</b> Revise the water quality accountability framework to include a new near-term deadline for the Bay TMDL and a nonpoint source pollution reduction strategy.	
<b>Agriculture / Farm Bill</b>  <b>Update</b>	<b>2014-</b> support the designation of the Chesapeake Bay Watershed as a high priority landscape in the 2014 Farm Bill's Regional Conservation Partnership Program	
	In October 2017 CAC sent a letter to the PSC Chair encouraging the coordination of the Bay States for a strategy to increase bay-wide conservation funding in the 2018 Farm Bill.	
	In November 2017 the House and Senate introduced the Chesapeake Bay Farm Bill Enhancement Acts of 2017 for consideration to reauthorize the Farm Bill in 2018	
	<b>2019:</b> A lack of coordination and prioritization among the federal agencies that provide technical assistance to farmers has stalled progress on forested buffers. There are available funds in the Farm Bill. EC should engage with the Sec. of Agriculture and other USDA officials to provide leadership on this issue.	
	<b>2023:</b> EC should work with the Chesapeake Watershed Congressional Delegation to ensure the next Farm Bill supports Bay restoration and conservation Goals outlined in the 2014 Watershed Agreement	As the next Farm Bill continues to be negotiated, the Chesapeake Bay Commission is working with the Chesapeake Watershed Congressional Delegation to ensure that Farm Bill programs and regional water quality and watershed



		restoration goals are in alignment.
<b>Jobs/Workforce</b>	<b>2020:</b> Encourage the CBP to track and report the number of federal, state, and local jobs associated with its funding to demonstrate the dual power of watershed protection and a restoration economy	
<b>Public Health / Workforce Development</b>	<b>2020:</b> multi-disciplinary approach to environmental health by engaging your <b>environmental and public health agencies</b> together to discuss creating an integrated system that can track crucial information about the environment and how it relates to public health across all communities analysis of the relationship between degraded water quality and public health in traditionally underserved or marginalized communities providing data on state and federally funded investments in water quality protections in Black, Indigenous, people of color, and low-income communities.	
<b>Member Need-Based Honorarium</b>	<b>2022:</b> Address a barrier of inclusive engagement and advance the CBP's commitments to DEIJ by providing <b>stipends to eligible volunteers</b> of the Advisory Committees and the Workgroups	
	<b>2023: Need-based honoraria</b> for eligible Committee volunteers are necessary to demonstrate the Partnership's commitment to DEIJ, and enable meaningful engagement of underrepresented communities when time and money are barriers to participation.	
<b>Chesapeake Bay Grants</b>	<b>2021:</b> Review publicly funded Bay-related grant opportunities with stringent <b>matching fund stipulations</b> for modification to a more equitable process	
	<b>2024: Convene a forum</b> of partners to identify and implement changes that increase engagement of	

community-based organizations and <b>lower grant barriers.</b>	
----------------------------------------------------------------	--

**Quick Glance of CAC’s Executive Council Recommendations by years:**

2023- Need-Based Honorariums to advance DEIJ, charge the PSC to use the new actions plans for forest buffers and wetlands to accelerate progress, fund high-resolution land use tool and analysis for local government use, work with Congress to ensure next Farm Bill supports the Watershed Agreement goals, enhance funding for conservation programs

2022- confirm the credibility of the CBP with accountability to the goals of the *Watershed Agreement*, hire more agency staff agency staff to enforce existing regulations, need-based honorariums, create a watershed-wide approach for large-scale solar development

2021- expedite implementation of the prioritized practices that deliver co-benefits for water quality, healthy habitats, and living resources in a changing climate, develop a framework that outlines how jurisdictions anticipate their use of the remaining American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds and the new infrastructure funds, direct jurisdictions to ensure their policies are aligned with the assess the Chesapeake Executive Directive 21-1 *Collective Action for Climate Change*, access state capacity to deliver climate resilient programs; federal agencies to review publicly funded Bay-related grant opportunities with stringent matching fund stipulations for modification to a more equitable process,

2020- encourage a multi-disciplinary approach to environmental health by engaging your environmental and public health agencies together to discuss creating an integrated system that can track crucial information about the environment and how it relates to public health across all communities, prioritize equitable enforcement of regulations in anticipation of economic impacts of the pandemic, for example communities with Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4); track and report the number of federal, state and local jobs associated Chesapeake Bay funding

2019- use technological tools like satellite imagery to help with BMP verification of practices; increase federal agencies coordination to accelerate forested buffers and technical assistance for farmers, engage with the Secretary of Agriculture and the Farm Bill; expand and support programs and incentives to advance the important objectives of environmental education and green workforce development

2018- develop programmatic infrastructure and financial support for meaningful BMP verification as a part of implementation of Phase 3 WIPs, particularly in accounting for growth and land use changes and co-benefits; increase forest buffers and wetlands, communicate local co-benefits they provide, allow states to use 319 Clean Water Act Grant Programs and State Revolving Loan Funds for forest buffers on non-agricultural lands; simplify the process for landowners to use Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP), Wetlands Reserve Easement (WRE), and other conservation practices; environmental education should include workforce development and training to support the next generation of stewards with options for living wage environmental careers; continue to convene the high-level leaders every two years to discuss progress of the Watershed Agreement Environmental Education goal and outcomes.

2017- Urge Congress to restore federal funding for agencies supporting Chesapeake Bay restoration, education, monitoring and jobs

2016- Environmental Literacy/Education; Oysters; Local Engagement on Phase III WIPs

2015- Take Advantage of Federal Funding and Untapped Resources; Make the Water Agreement Relevant on the Local Level; Enhance Accountability by including Verification as an Element of Implementation

2014- Emphasize Local Benefits in the Watershed Agreement Management Strategies; Commit to the Resources Required to Meet the Commitments in the Agreement and use federal funds; Continue Strengthening Consistency in BMP Verification

2013- Focused on Watershed Agreement- All jurisdictions should participate in all of the Agreement goals (concern about the Opt-Out provision); Transparency Principle supports BMP verification; Environmental Literacy goal should be included; Include a Toxic Containment goal; Acknowledge Climate Change and show in the Management Strategies how practices will adapt for it; Conowingo Dam;

2012- Environmental Literacy; Public Access to Waterways; funding for Land Conservation; Water Quality Trading; Phase II WIPs must be enforceable and enforced, EC should regularly report on progress; set goals for fisheries, habitats, living resources and stewardship

2011- Independent Evaluation; WIPs- enforceable, transparent reporting, critical to ensure voluntary non-point sources are doing their part; Federal Funding cuts and Executive Order; Marcellus Shale Drilling impacts

2010- Executive Order; Equity- both regulated and non-regulated sources do their share and bring in U.S. Dept of Education, U.S. Dept of Transportation, FERC, and EPA lead by example in DC with federally owned lands; Accountability, “Do No Harm”- Marcellus Shale, increasing stormwater pollution from impervious surfaces, and Conowingo Dam; Citizen Engagement through Public Access to waterways

2009- Accountability- 2 Year Milestones, Independent Evaluator, Do No Harm with Stimulus Funding, Reasonable Assurance in the TMDL; Accelerating nonpoint pollution controls with new regulations and legislation; Citizen Engagement- support No Child Left Inside, create state environmental literacy programs, protect and increase public access to waterways, especially in underserved communities; consider human health impacts of water quality decisions (toxins and endocrine disruptors), address the sediment build-up behind the Conowingo Dam

2008- Independent Evaluator- truly independent and focus on impediments implementation of the Tributary Strategies; support 2 year goals to measure progress and target resources and develop consequences through enhanced enforcement; states must address land conversion and the C2K Sprawl Goal; Emerging Issues- Marcellus Shale Drilling Impacts, use the precautionary principle when considering the introduction of non-native oyster species