Citizens Advisory Committee
TO THE CHESAPEAKE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

April 30, 2015

Via email: agreement@chesapeakebay.net

Nick DiPasquale, Chair
Chesapeake Bay Program Management Board
410 Severn Ave, Suite 109
Annapolis, MD 21403

Dear Nick,

On behalf of the Citizens' Advisory Committee, please accept the following and attached comments on the Management Strategies for: Citizen Stewardship; Environmental Literacy, Diversity; Local Leadership; Climate; Wetlands; Riparian Forest Buffers; Stream Health; Public Access; Healthy Watersheds; Urban Tree Canopy; Toxics; Fish Habitat; Fish Passage; and Water Quality.

We commend you and the Principals' Staff Committee for extending the public comment period on the draft strategies and for the many improvements on the strategies since our last review. To ensure progress in achieving the outcomes and public confidence that the strategies are working, we recommend that the Workplans be benchmarked with 2-year Milestones that coincide with the Watershed Implementation Plan 2-Year Milestones.

Thank you for the opportunity to share our comments on the draft Management Strategies. Please feel free to contact me or the CAC Coordinator, Jessica Blackburn at (804)775-0953 and jblackburn@allianceforthebay.org if you have additional questions.

Sincerely,

Charlie Stek
Chair, Citizens' Advisory Committee

Jessica M. Blackburn, CAC Coordinator
612 Hull Street, Suite 101C | Richmond, VA 23224 | (804)775-0953 | jblackburn@allianceforthebay.org |

Chesapeake Bay Program
A Watershed Partnership

Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay

Citizen Stewardship Management Strategy

This is a thorough and comprehensive strategy. If there is a weakness it is that it is hard to measure/quantify the goal to "*increase* the number and diversity of local citizen stewards…." For example, one measurable outcome could be to produce a map/list of every river, section of the river or stream in the watershed where no Riverkeeper or other organization is active in the protection of that river.

- We recommend building capacity in communities where there are major gaps in engaged citizens.
- Placed-based education or service learning opportunities should be incorporated in the strategy.

The following are comments that may help to grow the diversity of stewards in the watershed:

- Implementing partners should seek to learn the local social, economic, environmental priority issues, which have been historically identified by local leaders, and find innovative ways to assist using environmental principles that also meet CBP priorities. For example, CBP partners may consider working with local leaders to address self identified community issues such as technical and financial assistance for minority and low resource farmers meeting water quality requirements, or urban blight issues such as illegal dumping and abandoned housing. These kinds of self identified community issues are already a community priority and have environmental consequences as well as social and economic.
- To convert volunteerism into lifelong stewardship, in some communities, particularly underserved, students must be engaged in volunteerism that connects with education, community, environment, as well as economic success. Volunteer programs must also engage students with internships, jobs and college programs related to Bay restoration.
- We agree with the notion that people support healthy community initiatives, including those protecting water, but that opinions on related programs vary based on perspective. Working within the context of existing community needs can help broaden local support for environmental activities and increasing stewards.
- Early engagement of community leaders on issues that impact consumer choices that could disincentivize stewardship actions (plastic bags/Styrofoam products) could lead to better local support of market based changes.
- Work with the Diversity Action Team to develop baseline data of diversity of staff, Board and volunteers in relevant agencies and non-profits as a first step to develop a strategy for increasing diversity of stewards.
- The workplans should include building on successes of local programs and replicating them.
- Consider collaboration with the Diversity and Environmental Literacy strategies to look at designing success pathways from grade school to College Degree programs to Internships to Green Careers creating a professional environmental steward class for the future.

Chesapeake Bay Program
A Watershed Partnership

Jessica M. Blackburn, CAC Coordinator
612 Hull Street, Suite 101C | Richmond, VA 23224 | (804)775-0953 | jblackburn@allianceforthebay.org |

Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay

Environmental Literacy Management Strategy

CAC continues to recommend that the U.S. Department of Education become an official partner with the Bay Program to assist states and local governments in achieving the Environmental Literacy goal by providing federal resources through existing programs to support Environmental Literacy. Among the best opportunities to advance Environmental Literacy is through the Next Generation Science Standards, Common Core or similar state standards, and STEM, and U.S. Dept of Education can provide financial support to develop Environmental Literacy.

The *Management Approach* should be more descriptive and directive in terms of how students will receive professional development. Environmental advocates have called for professional development and environmental literacy to environmental education that prepares students to qualify for acceptance into higher education programs (See Diversity Outcome Management Approaches under Potential Actions). These college and university programs in related fields such as hydrology, environmental engineering, geology, etc. will be the precursor for job attainment in the field. In fact, in the name of professional development literacy programs should be coordinated with Degrees programs; then non-profits that can offer entry level jobs, or internships. Ultimately, these working professionals will be more likely to serve the environmental interest of their communities in an economically sustainable way.

The section identified as *Cross Outcome Collaboration and Multiple Benefits* should be sure to identify the Employment and Professional Engagement Workgroup under the Diversity Action Team, working to meet the Stewardship Goal, as collaborator.

Jessica M. Blackburn, CAC Coordinator
612 Hull Street, Suite 101C | Richmond, VA 23224 | (804)775-0953 | jblackburn@allianceforthebay.org |

Diversity Management Strategy

This strategy rightly embraces the notion that decision makers should be a reflection of the communities that will be impacted by subsequent environmental policies. It is a commendable start. Here are some comments that could help strengthen the strategy:

- "Baseline and Current Conditions" section and under "Environmental Justice Conditions Present Challenges" there should be mention of Environmental Justice as a prevailing principle in the Chesapeake Bay Agreement. Some partners that could be involved in implementing the strategy are: Maryland Commission of Environmental Justice and Sustainable Communities, the non-profits Clean Water Action, and Green For All, and Brocoli City. Green For All and Brocoli City have already embarked on successful marketing to African-American and Latino communities to encourage engagement in environmentally related issues. Their expertise would be useful to the Chesapeake Bay Program.
- Under "Reaching Diverse Communities with Employment Opportunities and Professional Development." There should be a focus on recruitment in Minority Serving Institutions, Community Colleges, and Historically Black Colleges with the intent to develop environmental professionals to enter non-profits and local agencies. Consider surveying and sharing information with the various environmental justice entities in the Bay Watershed, for example in the Washington D.C. and Maryland area, there are at least two, the Maryland Commission on Environmental and Sustainable Communities and the DMV Environmental Justice Coalition.
- Under "Current Efforts and Gaps," encourage watershed non-profits to offer baseline data on their current diversity and strategies on how they may become more diverse.
- The Employment and Professional Engagement management approach is excellent. It is certainly reasonable to incorporate employment and professional engagement in environmental literacy initiatives and programs. This will be key to build long term, sustainable stewards in under-served, low-income communities.
- The Promoting Environmental Justice management approach is also excellent. We know that environmental justice is not just about where you live, but who makes decisions for you. The "Key Area of Emphasis" focusing on bringing more qualified, diverse parties to the table is primed to address inclusion as a desired environmental justice principle for mainstream groups to adopt.

Chesapeake Bay Program
A Watershed Partnership

Jessica M. Blackburn, CAC Coordinator
612 Hull Street, Suite 101C | Richmond, VA 23224 | (804)775-0953 | jblackburn@allianceforthebay.org |

Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay

Local Leadership Management Strategy

While there are improvements since the first draft, the local leadership strategy is perhaps the least developed of all the strategies. It documents the challenges and gaps to achieve the goal to "Continually increase the knowledge and capacity of local officials on issues related to water resources and in the implementation of economic and policy incentives that will support local conservation actions." The strategy notes that "specific suggestions will be considered during development of the workplan, which will be completed by the end of 2015." This makes it difficult to comment on the management strategy.

Clearly it is a challenge to continually increase the knowledge of some 1800 units of local government and the 10s if not 100s of thousands of local elected and appointed officials and their senior staffs. Perhaps one way to start is narrow the numbers by identifying those local jurisdictions in the watershed which encompass waters which contribute the largest sources of pollution to a river or stream which flows into the Chesapeake and targeting those leaders initially for awareness building, outreach and education utilizing existing non-profits or state programs with education capacities.

- The Strategy should still try to focus more on rivers and local waters and less on the Bay. Most local officials will connect better to local waters than to the Bay. The strategy can be strengthened to better make those connections.
- We commend the inclusion of using outdoor field trips, boat trips and/or farm trips for local decisions makers to help increase knowledge and change perspectives. We hope the workplan will stress a more systematic approach.
- It is good to see the mention of using existing local government forums as a way to deliver the messages. We encourage the inclusion of more concrete steps on delivering the message using existing local government associations and existing leadership programs into the workplan.
- We still believe the strategy should include Land Use related workgroups in the cross-goal collaboration.

Chesapeake Bay Program
A Watershed Partnership

Jessica M. Blackburn, CAC Coordinator
612 Hull Street, Suite 101C | Richmond, VA 23224 | (804)775-0953 | jblackburn@allianceforthebay.org |

Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay

Climate Management Strategies

Overall this is an improved version of the last draft strategy. It is clear however, that there is much left to do and that this Outcome is dependent on other Management Strategies also addressing climate concerns. Below are some of the comments that were previously submitted that we encourage you to reconsider for the final strategy:

- While Local Engagement is alluded to in the strategy we still believe there can be more focus on this. Don't just focus on coastal communities. Final Strategy needs to recognize that parts of the watershed will require different approaches.
- Natural System Factors should include subsidence of land that is compounding the issue in some areas like Hampton Roads.
- Human System Factors: The final strategy needs to consider decision-makers views on the science/reality of climate impacts.
- We still believe that establishing Adaptation Outcome Priorities will be challenging but vital to the partnership's efforts working with landowners and localities.
- Final Strategy should discuss how to incentivize private landowner actions.
- Adaptation needs to recognize that there are regulatory barriers to addressing climate impacts. Some of those are perceived or real barriers (like lack of specific legal authority). VA DCR could not incorporate into Stormwater BMPs an allowance for future climate changes in the Virginia stormwater regulations, because the agency did not have specific authority to do so. This is a big issue that needs acknowledging and addressing. There is uncertainty over local government authority to address climate, sea level rise, and recurring flooding. The Bay Program should support efforts to clarify local authority.
- We still think that a list of preferred BMPs that will address both Climate impacts and Stormwater runoff would greatly help localities AND be efficient and innovative in addressing multiple Bay watershed concerns. This should include the promotion of living shorelines as an alternative to hardening shores.

Chesapeake Bay Program
A Watershed Partnership

Jessica M. Blackburn, CAC Coordinator
612 Hull Street, Suite 101C | Richmond, VA 23224 | (804)775-0953 | jblackburn@alliancefortheBay.org |

Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay

Wetlands Management Strategy

There does not seem to be much change or improvement over the previous draft. The strategy is primarily concerned with improving reporting and argues for additional resources but does not really offer ideas or a strategy on how to actually increase restoration. We believe that many of the comments we previously submitted still apply for the current draft strategy:

- The Wetlands Management Strategy appears to be in a very early stage of development. There is some information on the programs, priorities, and activities of Maryland, USDA/NRCS and the Corps, but no mention of the work of others and no indication that the workgroup has suggested priorities for the partnership.
- The "Biennial Workplan" sounds as if the effort is beginning from scratch. This is quite disappointing in light of the lack of progress toward the goals of creating 85,000 acres of wetlands and enhancing 150,000 acres of degraded wetlands. To date, it appears that just over 5,000 acres have been created.
- One opportunity the workgroup could explore is the use of dredged material to create wetlands. In addition to large scale port deepening projects which may involve millions of cubic yards of potential wetland substrate, dredged material from smaller marina and channel dredging projects could be beneficially re-used rather than simply side cast. There is the potential to require re-use as a permit condition. If dredged material is placed on a gradient, it is possible that wetlands could "retreat" in the face of sea level rise.
- Another significant opportunity may be afforded by surface transportation projects. Mitigation and stormwater management requirements could be biased toward wetland creation and enhancement.
- The jurisdictions could also encourage the development of wetland mitigation banks on sites which would maximize potential water quality benefits. Maryland and Virginia would seem to have the greatest potential to create and enhance wetlands in settings which would be useful in nutrient processing, followed by Delaware. Some River wetland restoration in NY, WV and PA is possible.
- Developing jurisdiction-specific goals for restoration and enhancement would be valuable. It is hard to believe that only 9 acres of creation has taken place in Virginia over the last 2 years and 205 acres over 4 years. One can only hope that this is a reporting error. Otherwise this lack of progress should certainly be brought to the attention of the Principals and the Executive Council.

Chesapeake Bay Program
A Watershed Partnership

Jessica M. Blackburn, CAC Coordinator
612 Hull Street, Suite 101C | Richmond, VA 23224 | (804)775-0953 | jblackburn@allianceforthebay.org |

Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay

Riparian Forest Buffer Management Strategy

The strategy has been improved significantly from the first draft. The appendices contain a lot of critical information. The concern remains the "soft-pedaling" in III. under the "other factors list: a. The lack of clear prioritization (and maybe stronger incentives) for forest buffers vs. grass buffers remains a problem. Perhaps a bigger problem is the continued willingness of states and EPA to support livestock exclusion without a function buffer with significant funding. This sends a clear message that it is acceptable not to get (or perhaps even push for) forested buffers. There are still concerns about low re-enrollment; there are conditions where the RFBs will stay in place as well as places where they are much more likely to be recruited back into production- the strategy and workplan should focus appropriately. Many of CAC's previous comments apply for the current draft:

- Page 1, II – many buffers are much less than 100" in width, it might be relevant to have the table show how many miles at 50' or 35' (since CBP accepts 35').
- Page 1, III - The discrepancy noted is very significant. We know that many of the CREP buffers that are not re-enrolling are remaining in place on the ground – but we have no tracking mechanism. County FSA offices are the only places that currently have the level of detail to indicate how many contracts (and acreage) have come out of CREP and how many new ones have gone in. Without that level of detail, the USDA numbers will become less meaningful over time.
- Page 3, V – another very important issue is that funder (state, private, and USDA) keep funding programs that provide strong incentives for streambank fencing without forest buffers or with very narrow buffers. This makes it significantly more difficult to "sell" forest buffers.
- Page 3, VI :
    - Competing, sub-standard programs are a problem – see above
    - Uncertain whether not having robust easement programs is a big problem. There are a lot of details driving that issue.
    - Not really convinced that lack of targeting is a big problem. We need so many buffers that they're all important. Targeting can utilize a lot of additional resources for low value (in terms of modeled reductions). There may be a different reality when local impairment issues are also at play.
- Page 4, VII – as noted above, stop funding sub- standard programs and to drive landowner acceptance of forest buffers. The science clearly supports it.
- Page 6, VII - The Task Force Summary is good info.
- Page 9, VIII – revisit the issue in #2 (above). Being able to accurately assess what's happening in CREP is instrumental in assessing overall progress.
- Page 10, IX - Overall comment – Greatest concern is that the actions that are committed link directly to resources for on the ground actions. Commitments of dollars and staff time are essential to creating accountability.

Chesapeake Bay Program
A Watershed Partnership

Jessica M. Blackburn, CAC Coordinator
612 Hull Street, Suite 101C | Richmond, VA 23224 | (804)775-0953 | jblackburn@allianceforthebay.org |

Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay

Stream Health Management Strategy

While this draft is a distinct improvement, many of CAC's previous comments still apply. The concerns are not so much with the details, but some overarching principles. In many cases, channel and floodplain issues (noted on page 5) are best treated by addressing watershed condition, establishing a forested buffer, and allowing time and natural process to re-establish a dynamic equilibrium. There are ways to do additional work and jump start components of this process.

Urban streams are much more difficult to address – with much higher rate of project failure and lower rates of restoration success – because it is so difficult/expensive to remedy watershed condition. Intervening with channel and floodplain redesign is incredibly expensive (we don't have the enough funds to solve our problems that way), but it's fun, visible, immediate, and the consultants will always advocate for it in their own financial interest. We agree with the strategy's comments on permitting issues, but we are also very aware that addressing them will lead to many more questionable projects being implemented and spending more money (that we may not be able to afford) on in-channel projects.

CAC's previous comments:

- Agree with greater focus on local stream health, but there are some shortcomings in the proposed structure and uncertainty about how this overlays with individual state programs for assessing stream health and/or impairment. Does this become a point of confusion or contention?
- Page 1, Baseline issues – Consider that many groups are now looking at most macro-invertebrates at a species level. This level of resolution will enable much better resolution when asking /answering questions about system response/recovery with respect to stressors.
- Page 4, Current Efforts – Concerns about the Stream Functions Pyramid Framework. There is an implication that lower levels drive responses of upper level functions in ways that are problematic
- The definitional questions around what does or should constitute "stream restoration" continue to be problematic. There is very limited data to support many of the assumptions of sediment and nutrient load reduction or "stream health" that are attributed to much of the project work affiliated with channel alterations, bank stabilization and wholesale stream and/or floodplain alteration. Tremendous amounts of funding continue to flow into projects with questionable outcomes.
- Overall, there is probably a lot of science and policy work to be done on definitions, outcomes, and priorities. The Strategy is largely consistent with this – but needs to be clarified that this is a strategy about gaining understanding, not prioritizing implementation at this point.

Chesapeake Bay Program
A Watershed Partnership

Jessica M. Blackburn, CAC Coordinator
612 Hull Street, Suite 101C | Richmond, VA 23224 | (804)775-0953 | jblackburn@allianceforthebay.org |

Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay

Public Access Management Strategy

There are a number of comments that CAC submitted for the previous draft that have not been included. We encourage you to consider some the following recommendations for the revised strategy or workplans:

- Include Environmental Literacy in the cross-goal collaboration.
- Quality, not just quantity, of access: We believe that improvements are necessary not only in the *number* of access sites, but in the *quality* and variety of shoreline, water-based recreational opportunities offered. We recommend that the strategy set a goal or target of increasing the percentage of Bay watershed shoreline in each state that is publicly accessible for *multiple uses* such as swimming, boating, camping, and fishing.
- Camping Access: We recommend that camping access be added to the types of access that will be tracked toward meeting the current 300-site goal. The strategy notes the strong public demand for camping access along the Bay watershed's shorelines, but fails to address specific management actions that will be taken to meet those demands, other than further analysis.
- Public waterway access along bridges and roads: Obstructions such as needlessly high guard rails and fences and the lack of safe shoulders or parking areas along the public rights-of-way of most roads and bridges in the watershed present major barriers which limit access to many rivers and streams in the watershed for fishing, kayaking and other non-motorized activities.
    - We recommend that this be added, along with railroads, to the list of key factors limiting access. We also believe more can be done to advance public access along roads and bridges than simply establishing MOUs with transportation departments.
    - We recommend that an inventory of all the bridges crossing navigable and fishable rivers and streams be established to identify bridges and approach roadways where waterway access for fishing, swimming, canoeing and kayaking can be provided reasonably and safely.
    - We recommend that all bridge construction and reconstruction projects currently in the planning and design process be reviewed to ensure that waterway access is incorporated into planned construction or reconstruction, where possible, that such access be given due consideration in the comprehensive transportation plans developed by each metropolitan planning organization and State and that funding under the Transportation Alternatives program of new Federal MAP-21 Act be allocated by the States for this purpose.
- Federal lands: We recommend that Federal agencies with land holdings along the shorelines of the Chesapeake watershed, including the National Park Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, BLM and Department of Defense be required to develop a plan, schedule and process for enhancing public water-based access at their facilities. We recommend that the Department of Defense clean up contaminated sites such as Poole's Island and/or identify excess property sites in the Chesapeake which can be transferred to public management entities for improved public access to the Bay's watershed's waterways. We recommend that the Army Corps of Engineers explore enhancing public water-based recreation in the Chesapeake watershed associated with its navigation and public works projects.
- Ensure that stormwater management techniques like, "hardscaping" stream banks with rocks, does not become a deterrent for public access to the waterway.

Chesapeake Bay Program
A Watershed Partnership

Jessica M. Blackburn, CAC Coordinator
612 Hull Street, Suite 101C | Richmond, VA 23224 | (804)775-0953 | jblackburn@allianceforthebay.org |

Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay

Healthy Watersheds Management Strategy

This strategy continues to improve and evolve with good direction. There will be difficulty in implementing some of the approaches do to competition for already scarce resources. The acknowledgement of taking care of places that are not already a problem is an important step for the CBP.

Urban Tree Canopy

One way to address gaps in Tree Survival/Maintenance, especially in densely populated urban areas hit hard by summer storms, is to continue and increase coordination between local agencies, non-profits, and utilities intended to protect property from and assist homeowners with maintaining over hanging tree limbs threatening property and human safety. This may be of special interest to less engaged homeowners who are concerned about utility cost benefits from added canopy shade, but also from damage prevention through proper maintenance. This is a potential outreach strategy.

Toxics Management Strategies

This strategy is only really about PCBs. It should be broad enough to incorporate new and emerging toxins in future workplans. Can there also be a regulatory strategy based on inspecting and increased reporting from bad actors?

Fish Passage Management Strategy

If it is not already a priority, along with the other great Management Strategy Approaches, we recommend coordination with the fish barrier removal projects identified in the Anacostia Watershed Restoration Plan. Engaging local leaders in the Anacostia Watershed, which encompasses Washington D.C., Prince George's County, and Montgomery County, is also desired. As of 2010, there were 146 fish blockage projects identified by the US Army Corps of Engineers totaling $35,172,500, but only approximately 37 were included in the Fish Passage Outcome Management Strategy, see Attribute Table in Fish Passage Prioritization Map. Coordinating efforts to fund these projects with local leaders in the Anacostia Watershed would be energy well spent to support herring, shad, and striped bass species. Please, review the Anacostia Watershed Restoration Plan.

Chesapeake Bay Program
A Watershed Partnership

Jessica M. Blackburn, CAC Coordinator
612 Hull Street, Suite 101C | Richmond, VA 23224 | (804)775-0953 | jblackburn@allianceforthebay.org |

Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay

Water Quality Management Strategy

CAC was notified that the comments previously sent on the earlier draft strategy would not yet be fully considered and incorporated in the current draft. We acknowledge that the workplan may be the more appropriate place for some of CAC comments. We must also acknowledge that the successful completion of the water quality outcome will require significant new resources, including staff and funding, as well as additional enforcement that may not have existed to date. We look forward to engaging with the Water Quality Goal Implementation Team on the below comments previously submitted:

- While this may be an adequate summary of the TMDL/WIP process, not sure it adds anything at all.
- Not very optimistic about achieving the extent of implementation of BMPs by nonpoint sources that will be necessary to achieve the TMDL and the water quality improvements the Bay needs. It would be wonderful to see this strategy explore some ways States and Federal agencies believe that participation could be increased.
- The Water Quality "Strategy" is a 9 page exposition of the Bay TMDL. The States and DC have made a major effort to meet the timeframes in the TMDL and supply the WIPs that EPA has required. The contribution of different categories of pollution sources varies among jurisdictions. Each jurisdiction has been accorded considerable flexibility in choosing the mix of actions by which it will meet the limits specified in the TMDL.
- Since the TMDL derives from a specific Clean Water Act requirement it is understandable that it has been and will be the focus of water quality improvement efforts by EPA and the jurisdictions. But the TMDL is more of a process framework than a strategy. Strategic choices have been made by the jurisdictions in the WIPs and EPA has worked with the jurisdictions to clarify and strengthen the WIPs.
- The Management Strategy is primarily about how progress or lack thereof, in meeting two year targets for achieving 2017 and 2025 outcomes will be evaluated and reported. Progress assessments will look at both implementation commitments and environmental outcomes. Monitoring of water quality conditions will be conducted and reported annually. However, because of lag times in seeing the results of implementation actions and uncertainties about the effectiveness of some N, P, and sediment control measures, models will be used to predict environmental outcomes and guide decisions on whether implementation commitments should be adjusted. The models, in turn, rely on predicted effectiveness values. It is critical that the public as well as members of the partnership understand how these values are arrived at (recurring CAC themes of transparency and independent evaluation) and have the ability to comment on how much uncertainty may exist.
- What are the changes to current "monitoring assessments" that are going to "determine" when the state's standards are achieved?
- What is the process for and how can the public engage in "conduct selected assessments of factors affecting progress towards for restoring water quality, habitat, fish and wildlife, and conserving lands, including the effects of management activities"?
- What actions will the Program take now to prepare the public for the likelihood that there is no way that 60% of the practices will be "in place" to meet water quality goals in 2 years? This is something that should be honestly faced with steps lined out to deal with it -- instead of shifting numbers to make it.
- What are the specific steps (and by whom) will the Partnership…"Continually improve the capacity to monitor and assess the effects of management actions being undertaken to implement the Bay TMDL and improve water quality"?

Jessica M. Blackburn, CAC Coordinator
612 Hull Street, Suite 101C | Richmond, VA 23224 | (804)775-0953 | jblackburn@allianceforthebay.org |

- "Use the monitoring results to report annually to the public on progress made in attaining established Bay water quality standards and trends in reducing nutrients and sediment in the watershed" - Can this reporting be done on a river or segment basis so there can be a sense of stewardship developed by the public for protecting "their" special places? And so the Program can begin to evaluate impacts of management practices?
- Currently some jurisdictions report that they are meeting their Ag targets, yet the water quality trends for P are declining. How will the Program reconcile this "implementation"? Please refer to the recent report by EIP which uses the NMP and AIR data reported by the farmer to document that a large % of NMP have not been written. Many that have are not being followed. The point being -- progress being reported by the states is over estimated.
- What action is being taken to incorporate an association of water quality standards with 'benefits for the protection of human health'?
- Recent analysis reported by the Public Interest Project documents the terrible lack of staffing at the Conservation District level. Yet TMDL implementation will rely on local action from partners like the Districts. Is there a specific initiative that can be developed to address this problem?
- Factors Influencing Goal and Outcome Attainment- There should be 5 factors -- the first and foremost being Public Understanding that the Program actions are verified and transparent.
- Good to see the specific mentions of climate change and population growth
- CAC is pleased to hear from the Ag workgroup that the NMP panel process will be adjusted to increase public and expert review.
- "Adopting principles to verify that reported practices are, indeed, in place and functioning as designed"- This might be the single most important aspect of the TMDL process. It should receive specific attention in this Management Strategy to explain how it will be implemented.
- "Further quantifying the effect of variations in watershed properties (such as different types of soils) on controls" - Does this include addressing the impact of NMP implementation on P saturated soils?
- The assessment of data inputs, water quality monitoring, modeling, etc… are very complicated but essential elements of the Mid Point Assessment. The ability to include the public in this process is a critical but difficult task given the complexity of the issues. However, if the model inputs allow inappropriate credit to be assigned to a practice, the jurisdiction will meet its WIP commitments on paper - but changes will not follow in the water. Point being - this is worth special attention of a group with technical support. It also must be done with the willingness of the jurisdictions to welcome the additional review - not to fight it.
- "The Bay TMDL is supported by rigorous accountability measures to ensure cleanup commitments are established and met, including short and long-term benchmarks, a tracking and accountability system for jurisdictions activities" Are these independently evaluated or Self-reported?
- "The jurisdictions identified gaps between their current capacity and the capacity they estimate is necessary to fully attain the interim and final nutrient and sediment target loads for each of the 92 drainage areas for impaired segments of the Bay TMDL. Necessary new capacity includes additional incentives, new or enhanced state or local regulatory programs, market-based tools, technical or financial assistance, and new legislative authorities. It also includes capacity from other federal agencies, local governments, the private sector, and/or non-governmental organizations." It would be helpful to identify these "additional" needs publicly so a campaign can be mounted to gain the necessary political and financial support for them.
- The "Descriptions of efforts currently underway or planned to improve transparent and consistent monitoring, tracking, and reporting and assess the effectiveness of implementation actions are included in the WIPs" are not in sufficient detail to track or assist.

- Is PA the only jurisdiction concerned with "Dramatically increasing enforcement and compliance of state requirements for agriculture." and "Committing state funding to develop and implement state-of-the-art-technologies for converting animal manure to energy for farms"?
- "The CBP also has a basin wide reporting process for tracking implementation of management practices." But is it transparent, verifiable and reliable? See comment about EIP/CEAP reports.
- "Produce reports explaining water-quality change and lessons learned from BMPs and water-quality response." This is important - might relate to the need to develop simple public page made available through CBPO website --- and via Bay Journal and other avenues -- to continue to update this info.
- Summarize or attach a short description of how the BayTAS report process integrates with the public and how it includes independent verification.
- Summarize the current status of the process to improve verification.
- CAC is looking forward to engage in a process of enhanced public involvement in the expert panel process.
- Re: Assessing Progress- It is difficult to follow what actions are associated with the different points of this section and where is the independent evaluation?
- Re: Assessing Progress- this is the reason that getting the model correct is so important. IF the model says a NMP will reduce 1000 pounds of pollution (but it only reduces 10) -- then the state can report it reduced 100x more pollution than it really is doing -- and EPA will have to say it is meeting its milestones.
- It is important for the credibility of the program that there be an ability to demonstrate that there is transparency in the rationale behind modifications and improvements in modeling, monitoring and science.
- Where is the independent verification for showing why the management strategy workplans will be updated based on evaluation?

Jessica M. Blackburn, CAC Coordinator
612 Hull Street, Suite 101C | Richmond, VA 23224 | (804)775-0953 | jblackburn@allianceforthebay.org |