

SUMMER QUARTERLY MEETING – August 21st, 2024

*Chesapeake Bay Program*



# SAV Goal: Beyond 2025

*Brooke Landry  
Maryland DNR and  
Chair, SAV Workgroup*

*Through the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement, the Chesapeake Bay Program has committed to...*



## Goal: *Vital Habitats*

### Outcome:

Sustain and increase the habitat benefits of SAV in the Chesapeake Bay. Achieve and sustain the ultimate outcome of 185,000 acres of SAV Bay-wide necessary for a restored Bay. Progress toward this ultimate outcome will be measured against a target of 90,000 acres by 2017 and 130,000 acres by 2025.

*At the expiration of the current Agreement, we will have the opportunity to recommend updates to the SAV Outcome....*



## 2023 SAV Attainability Update for SRS



### Submerged Aquatic Vegetation (SAV)

#### Outcome

Sustain and increase the habitat benefits of submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV) in the Chesapeake Bay. Achieve and sustain the ultimate outcome of 185,000 acres of SAV Bay-wide necessary for a restored Bay. Progress toward this ultimate outcome will be measured against a target of 90,000 acres by 2017 and 130,000 acres by 2025.

#### Status

Between 2014 and 2018, SAV expanded by almost 33,000 acres in Chesapeake Bay, reaching approximately 108,000 acres in 2018, the highest acreage recorded since the annual Bay-wide SAV surveys began in 1984. Because of this record increase, SAV acreage exceeded the 2017 target of 90,000 acres in 2015, 2016, 2017, and 2018. Between 2018 and 2019, however, over 44,000 acres were lost, approximately one-third of the Bay's SAV. This loss has been attributed to degraded water clarity following two years of above-normal precipitation and subsequent high flows. Since that time, SAV has slowly begun to rebound, with the most recent data, collected in 2022, showing 76,462 acres of SAV throughout the Bay and its tidal tributaries. Additional years of increased acreage will help clarify whether this recent gain is the start of a new positive trend, but it is unlikely that the interim goal of 130,000 acres will be reached by 2025 regardless. Therefore, the [SAV Outcome](#) is considered off-course. The interim goal of 130,000 acres remains attainable in the future if additional management actions are taken to ensure long-term and consistent improvements in water clarity and shallow water habitat protection. The SAV Workgroup, however, recommends reevaluating the ultimate SAV acreage goal of 185,000 acres to determine if it should be updated. This goal was based on historical SAV distribution in Chesapeake Bay and conditions that may not be met again in the future given the projected effects of climate change.

## Beyond 2025 Strategy Review System

### What has helped achieve success since 2014?

- Management solutions
- Direct, small-scale, SAV restoration
- Collaboration and community engagement
- Increased research and monitoring

### What challenges have hindered progress?

- Pollution reductions have been inadequate to consistently improve water clarity
- Climate change impacts
- Existing statutes, regulations, and policies have been inadequate
- Shallow water use conflicts and habitat trade-offs
- Inadequate staffing, training, and funding

### What is needed to accelerate progress?


- Nutrient and sediment reductions *beyond* those currently allocated in the TMDL
- Community-specific understanding of both SAV patterns and processes
- Significant financial investments for SAV restoration
- An expanded monitoring effort that includes *Zannichellia*
- Structured decision making to equitably and effectively manage habitat trade-offs and shallow-water use conflicts



**Many things to consider  
as we determine our  
recommendations**



## Many things to consider as we determine our recommendations



### 185,000-acre goal

- 2014 Chesapeake Bay Agreement for the SAV Outcome.
- Based on sum of segment goals for each of the 92 SAV segments, *prior to correction (shoreline error cut off SAV that was inaccurately projected on land; actual sum is approx. 192,000 acres )*.
- Segment goals are based on either single best year for that segment or a composite of best years (to account for SAV movement).
- The Bay may have supported anywhere from 200,000 to 600,000 acres of SAV in the past (based on bathymetry, seed bank records, and aerial imagery), but there's no indication that that maximum acreage occurred during a single year.
- Climate change was not taken into consideration for SAV outcome.
- No end date associated with goal; interim goals established instead.
- 2017 = 90,000 acres; 2025 = 130,000 acres.

### 192,000-acre goal


- Updated acreage goal based on correction.
- Adopted by states for **water clarity standards assessment**.
- Not the recognized CBP goal; the overall CBP SAV goal remains at 185,000 acres.
- Virginia has updated some segment goals based on more recent single best year data; Maryland may follow suit.

### Some other-acre goal

- There are 43 segments that have exceeded their established goal at one time or another since 1971.
- If you increase the goals for the segments where the goal has been exceeded and combine those with the existing goals for the other segments where the goal has not been met, the total is 210,900 acres (if we increased segment goals based on SBY and kept those segments where goals are based on composites).
- If you add up the Single Best Years for each segment and not use composite data, the total of Single Best Years between 1971 and 2023 is 155,557 acres.

# Progress towards the Bay-wide SAV goal

Submerged Aquatic Vegetation Abundance (1984-2022)



1600s

European colonization

Wasting Disease

Tropical Storm Agnes

CB Degradation Study  
1976-1982  
N, P, TSS = culprits

CBP established,  
First Chesapeake Bay Agreement signed

Chesapeake Bay TMDL

Tropical Storm Lee and Hurricane Irene


2014 Chesapeake Bay Agreement

Rain, rain, and more rain



# Progress towards the Bay-wide SAV goal

Submerged Aquatic Vegetation Abundance (1984-2022)



▲ = 77,000 acres

1600s

European colonization

1930s

Wasting Disease

1972

Tropical Storm Agnes

1976

1982

CB Degradation Study  
1976-1982  
N, P, TSS = culprits

CBP established,  
First Chesapeake Bay Agreement signed

Chesapeake Bay TMDL

Tropical Storm Lee and Hurricane Irene

2014 Chesapeake Bay Agreement


Rain, rain, and more rain



## Modeling Climate Impacts on SAV in Chesapeake Bay

### Take home message:

*None* of the 8000 simulations resulted in meeting our SAV restoration target BUT accelerated and expanded nutrient management will get us closer than if we stick to the current allocations dictated in the TMDL.







## Questions for the SAV Workgroup membership to consider (go to Jamboard):

<https://jamboard.google.com/d/1QmeiaUq-cY2zJQDyCWZRo1yToIGNTimS5us1d4UI-no/viewer?f=o>


1. CBP Goals should be aspirational but realistic. Given this presentation (and the realities of watershed development and climate change and everything else you know about SAV that I don't need to tell you), do you believe the 185,000-acre goal is still achievable?
2. Regardless of achievability, would you prefer to keep the 185,000-acre goal or update it?
3. If we decide to update it, would you like to make it higher (based on corrected data and updated segment maximums) or lower (based on, for example, a compromise between known max extent ~192,000 ac~ and recent max extent ~108,000 ac~)?
4. Do you think the SAV Outcome should be based on more than one single numerical goal? For example, would you prefer distinct goals for each salinity zone (TF, OH, MH, PH)? This information is reported now but is not the ultimate goal.
5. Do you think the SAV Outcome should be based on something besides a numerical goal altogether? For example, the outcome could be based on contributing factors that are more within our control (ie. # of volunteer monitors, # of acres restored by seed, # of schools that teach detailed chapters on SAV ecology, etc.)
6. What about a combination of 4 and 5 – “a numerical outcome with contributing factors”. In this case we would have an acreage goal as well as factor goals.
7. Any additional thoughts, ideas, suggestions for the SAV Outcome Beyond 2025? Remember that this is just the beginning of the conversation. These questions were posed to get everyone thinking about where we want to go from here - not to solve it all today.



## Questions for the SAV Workgroup membership to consider (go to Jamboard):

<https://jamboard.google.com/d/1QmciaUq-cY2zJQDyCWZRo1yToIGNTfmS5us1d4UI-no/viewer?f=0>

1. CBP Goals should be aspirational but realistic. Given this presentation (and the realities of watershed development and climate change and everything else you know about SAV that I don't need to tell you), do you believe the 185,000-acre goal is still achievable?





## Questions for the SAV Workgroup membership to consider (go to Jamboard):

<https://jamboard.google.com/d/1QmeiaUq-cY2zJQDyCWZRo1yToIGNTfmS5usid4UI-no/viewer?f=0>

1. CBP Goals should be aspirational but realistic. Given this presentation (and the realities of watershed development and climate change and everything else you know about SAV that I don't need to tell you), do you believe the 185,000-acre goal is still achievable?

**Overwhelming response: YES, the goal is achievable.**

✓  
**Yes**

surveyed.

They are as

As part of the VIMS team, we are somewhat limited in

yes, its possible in the long-term future, but interim goals would be necessary . 10 years should not be 185K

g unforeseen ions (e.g., novel species expansion) and considering the modeling work from VIMS, climate change, etc., - no, but we might be able to get consistently close

Zannichellia coverage data may change this answer

✓  
V is incredibly resilient. It can recover very rapidly when the right conditions. This is able.



## Questions for the SAV Workgroup membership to consider (go to Jamboard):

<https://jamboard.google.com/d/1QmciaUq-cY2zJQDyCWZRoiyToIGNTImS5us1d4UI-no/viewer?f=o>

2. Regardless of achievability, would you prefer to keep the 185,000-acre goal or update it?

Nest segments to form larger trib-units

include regional/segment goals

Adding an reporting metric of % of segments meeting their goals would be useful as well.

Keep goal, but set more realistic timelines and corresponding interim goals

Update it to match something we can map - correct the error and go with 192K

keep ultimate 185,000 goal but have short-term targets as well

update with interim goals and consider having a range rather than a single number

keep for now, better is better, but higher and not achieving isn't

More interim goals to hit would give a boost, we could add more of them to stepwise achieve the big goal.

Percentage change rather than acreage?

**Need both!**

Use shallow water strategy from CESR to focus TMDL to basins where SAV goals more achievable

Yes, keep as is if the process of changing it will distract from the science needed.

Yes, lets keep it, or expand to 192,000. Going down is backsliding and compromising our future goals.



## Questions for the SAV Workgroup membership to consider (go to Jamboard):

<https://jamboard.google.com/d/1QmeiaUq-cY2zJQDyCWZRo1yToIGNTImS5us1d4UI-no/viewer?f=o>

2. Regardless of achievability, would you prefer to keep the 185,000-acre goal or update it?

**Mixed bag but  
leans toward:  
Update and include  
interim goals.**

Nest  
segments to  
form larger  
trib-units

Update it to  
something w  
map - correct  
error and go  
192K

boost, we could add  
more of them to  
stepwise achieve  
the big goal.

**Need  
both!**

Use shallow water  
strategy from CESR  
to focus TMDL to  
basins where SAV  
goals more  
achievable

Up goal, but  
more  
istic  
elines and  
responding  
rim goals

Yes, lets keep it, or  
expand to 192,000.  
Going down is  
backsliding and  
compromising our  
future goals.



## Questions for the SAV Workgroup membership to consider (go to Jamboard):

<https://jamboard.google.com/d/1QmciUq-cY2zJQDyCWZRo1yToIGNTfmS5usid4UI-no/viewer?f=o>

3. If we decide to update it, would you like to make it higher (based on corrected data and updated segment maximums) or lower (based on, for example, a compromise between known max extent ~192,000 ac~ and recent max extent ~108,000 ac~)?

get bay program help with sampling for permit areas to see if sav is actually present t when mapping is not available.

**Successful outcome will be important, so set up for success!**

based on the models run in the recent study, we should adjust the number down to meet the science that is available. this is still aspirational but realistic

192K is more in line with the jurisdictions' WQS, so that makes it a more logical goal...even if it is unlikely we would attain it.

If we update the "end goal" I would only go up to 192k or whatever makes sense. Adding new interim goals based on recent max extent, etc. would be ok.

update to include a range between 108k and 192k

If we could include Zannichellia, then we should increase the goal in some segments.

Need to see if other beds are also going deep and devise new survey techniques to capture. Maybe we already met 185K.

Keep the goal based on a spatial extent so that it can be evaluated in newly defined regions

Instead of historical extent/recent extent, what about a goal based on needs of living resources (crabs, juvenile fish, etc.)?

Persistent deep grass seems to be very rare

factor in sea-level rise and how that would allow for SAV migration/"new" potential SAV habitat in the future

Evaluate extent based on rolling average to minimize impact of inter-annual variation on communicating progress





## Questions for the SAV Workgroup membership to consider (go to Jamboree):

<http://cY2>

get bay pr  
help with  
for permit  
see if sav  
present t  
mapping  
available.

192K is  
with th  
jurisdic  
so that  
more l  
goal...e  
unlike  
attain

Instea  
extent  
extent  
a goal  
needs  
resour  
juveni

3. If we decide to update it, would you like to make it higher (based on corrected data and updated segment maximums) or lower (based on, for example, a compromise between known max extent ~192,000 ac~

**Most responses were more complicated than higher or lower but overall, comments lean toward keeping it as is or increasing it.**

o  
a  
108k

p the goal based  
a spatial extent  
that it can be  
uated in newly  
ned regions



progress



## Questions for the SAV Workgroup membership to consider (go to Jamboard):

<https://jamboard.google.com/d/1QmciaUq-cY2zJQDyCWZRo1yToIGNtImS5us1d4UI-no/viewer?f=o>

4. Do you think the SAV Outcome should be based on more than one single numerical goal? For example, would you prefer distinct goals for each salinity zone (TF, OH, MH, PH)? This information is reported now but is not the ultimate goal.

Yes, goals per salinity zone make sense. Build on success where beds are already established rather than expecting grass to magically pop up where it historically existed.

Since many cannot handle nuance, we need one number. Building that single number from a defensible aggregate of these zones would be a way to do both?

If we just focus on one goal, why look at any systems with less SAV. We'd just need to focus on the large areas

Lots of Zann in Magothy coves every year. Highly variable as to location but lots of it every year.

Adding it from here on in shouldn't need any particular explanation other than we can now find it. - What Chris said!!



## Questions for the SAV Workgroup membership to consider (go to Jamboard):

<https://jamboard.google.com/d/1QmeiaUq-cY2zJQDyCWZRo1yToIGNTimS5usid4UI-no/viewer?f=o>

4. Do you think the SAV Outcome should be based on more than one single numerical goal? For example, would you prefer distinct goals for each salinity zone (TF, OH, MH, PH)? This information is reported now but is not the ultimate goal.

Yes, goals per salinity zone make sense. Build on success where beds are already established.

Since many cannot handle nuance, we need one number. Building that single number from a

If we just focus on one goal, why look at any systems with

**Lots of checks on this response: Since many cannot handle nuance, we need one number. Building that one number from a defensible aggregate of these zones would be a way to do both. (this is essentially what we do now....)**



## Questions for the SAV Workgroup membership to consider (go to Jamboard):

<https://jamboard.google.com/d/1QmeiaUq-cY2zJQDyCWZR01yToIGNT1mS5us1d4UI-no/viewer?f=o>

These could be additional, but should not take the place of a tangible, on-the-ground goal for SAV extent/habitat quality.

These seem like they belong in our 2 year plan

**NO. Those measures are OK as social supplements but not reflective of any physical conditions in the bay.**

5. Do you think the SAV Outcome should be based on something besides a numerical goal altogether? For example, the outcome could be based on contributing factors that are more within our control (ie. # of volunteer monitors, # of acres restored by seed, # of schools that teach detailed chapters on SAV ecology, etc.)



## Questions for the SAV Workgroup membership to consider (go to Jamboard):

<https://jamboard.google.com/d/1QmeiaUq-cY2zJQDyCWZRo1yToIGNTfmS5us1d4UI-no/viewer?f=o>

These could be additional, but should not take the place of a tangible, on-the-ground goal for SAV extent/habitat quality. ✓

These seem like they belong in our 2 year plan

**No**

5. Do you think the SAV Outcome should be based on something besides a numerical goal altogether? For example, the outcome could be based on contributing factors that are more within our control (ie. # of volunteer monitors, # of acres restored by seed, # of schools that teach detailed chapters on SAV ecology, etc.)

**NO. Those measures are OK as social supplements but not reflective of any physical conditions in the bay.**



## Questions for the SAV Workgroup membership to consider (go to Jamboard):

<https://jamboard.google.com/d/1QmciaUq-cY2zJQDyCWZRo1yToIGNTimS5us1d4UI-no/viewer?f=o>

6. What about a combination of 4 and 5 – “a numerical outcome with contributing factors”. In this case we would have an acreage goal as well as factor goals.

**Sure**

Again, this seems very confusing. How would we measure success?





**Questions for the SAV Workgroup membership to consider (go to Jamboard):**

<https://jamboard.google.com/d/1QmciaUq-cY2zJQDyCWZRo1yToIGNTimS5usid4UI-no/viewer?f=o>

6. What about a combination of 4 and 5 – “a numerical outcome with contributing factors”. In this case we would have an acreage goal as well as factor goals.

**Everyone got too bored with this conversation to answer this one....**



## Google Form for SAV Outcome

<https://forms.gle/3pSkmspEA6w2poHy6>



Chesapeake Bay Program SAV Outcome Beyond 2025



All changes saved in Drive

Questions

Responses

Settings



### Chesapeake Bay Program SAV Outcome Beyond 2025

Form description

Email \*

Valid email

This form is collecting emails. [Change settings](#)

Name

Short answer text



# Questions?