Agreement Workplans: Structured Public Input and Comment Resolution

Gregory Barranco

March 16, 2016

Feedback: Land Use Methods & Metrics Development

The Land Use Methods and Metrics Outcome reads: "Continually improve the knowledge of land conversion and the associated impacts throughout the watershed. By 2016, develop a watershed-wide methodology and local-level metrics for characterizing the rate of farmland, forest and wetland conversion, measuring the extent and rate of change in impervious surface coverage and quantifying the potential impacts of land conversion to water quality, healthy watersheds and communities. Launch a public awareness campaign to share this information with local governments, elected officials and stakeholders."

The intent of the Metrics Outcome is to develop a method and metrics to monitor the conversion of valued natural and working landscapes, such as forests, wetlands and farms and to better understand the impacts of land conversion. Natural and working landscapes provide ecosystem services of value to the Chesapeake Bay and its population including water quality and quantity, habitat, recreation and food production.

To review the workplan, visit the Management Strategies Dashboard.

What do you think about the key actions proposed for the next two-year period?

Management Approach 1: Monitor the (rate of) conversion of forests, wetlands, farmlands, and impervious surfaces

Key Action 1: Design a manual, stratified sampling approach at the county level and assess land cover change from high resolution imagery circa 2005-2013.

How important is this key action for the next two years? *

- ⦿ High priority
- ○ Medium priority
- ○ Low priority

Key Action 2: Assess land use change throughout the entire Bay Watershed, at a 30 meter minimum mapping unit, from 1984-2011 using the Chesapeake Watershed Model Phase 6 land use database and the Multi-Resolution Land Characteristics Consortium (MRLC) National Land Cover database (NLCD).

How important is this key action for the next two years? *

- ⦿ High priority
- ○ Medium priority

General questions

Are there any additional critical actions needed in the next two years? (optional)

If your organization's work addresses a critical action not reflected here, please let us know about your work and your organization. (optional)

Name, Organization or Affiliation (optional)

Zip Code (optional)

How did you hear about your opportunity to comment on the workplans? (optional)

- ☐ Recommendation from another person
- ☐ Link from email our site sent you
- ☐ Link from another Web site
- ☐ Link from newspaper/magazine/newsletter article
- ☐ Search engine results
- ☐ Other, please specify

To review the workplans, or to comment on other workplans, visit the Management Strategies Dashboard.

Submit

Responses by the numbers

- **~70 sets of on-line comments**
  - Several organizations provided comments on multiple workplans: CBF, Ducks Unlimited, Trout Unlimited commented on many workplans.

- **16 individual letters** (including seven form letters)

- **6 funding comments**

~1-6 comments per work plan

Feedback: Workplan Funding Information

We are very interested in providing *funding information* on Chesapeake Bay watershed restoration in a format that is most useful to our partners, the public and stakeholders. We are currently considering several factors in how we will report this information. Please help us by answering the following questions:

How would your organization potentially use CBP workplan funding information?

How useful would it be to include a summary table of each partner's *combined total funding* for *all* Chesapeake Bay watershed efforts? *
- ◉ Very Useful
- ○ Somewhat Useful
- ○ Of Little or No Use

How useful would it be to include in each workplan a summary table showing each partner's total funding *for that workplan*? *
- ◉ Very Useful
- ○ Somewhat Useful
- ○ Of Little or No Use

How useful would it be to show each partner's funding contributions *toward each key action*? *
- ◉ Very Useful
- ○ Somewhat Useful

How would you use funding information?

- Target grant opportunities

- Support local initiatives

- Accountability

- Compare investments between states

Funding Summaries

How useful to show each partner's funding toward each key action v. rolled up funding info by partner?

- Very useful no matter how presented

Proposed deadline of reporting funding: best available by April or more detailed by Fall 2016

- 50/50

PSC decision:

Best available in April or more detailed in Fall 2016?

Responses by the numbers:16 Letters

- **7 watershed residents –** support for diversity/environmental justice issues

- **Chesapeake Bay Foundation –** Environmental Literacy, WIPs, Toxics, Healthy Watersheds

- **NOAA -** Environmental Literacy and Citizen stewardship; increased outreach and engagement to local communities

- **Virginia No Child Left Inside Coalition –** concern that workplans are not comprehensive or far reaching

- **Maryland Blue Crab Design Team -** allocation methodologies

- **Carroll County Land & Resource Management -** support for local government control over land use decisions and increased funding for local government efforts related to land use issues

- **Maryland State Water Quality Advisory Committee -** recommendations for cross-outcome coordination and a funding analysis for implementing the workplans

- **Sierra Club –** general support for CBP work on multiple outcomes

- **Trout Unlimited –** general support for CBP work on multiple outcomes

Highlights

Water Quality

Chesapeake Bay Foundation:
"...include more commitments to engage local partners in the two-year milestones...and describe how you will involve local entities in Phase III WIP development, and to develop local area targets."

(dovetails with the communication/outreach action in the Stakeholder Assessment Action Plan).

Highlights

Toxic Contaminants
Policy and Prevention

"Expand low level monitoring of PCBs"...it does not appear that [most states] are committed to using low level detection methods"

Highlights

Environmental Literacy

"...recommend that all states identify specific courses that qualify for MWEEs...and assign a full time environmental literacy coordinator to liaison with LEA's and natural resource agencies."

Highlights

Healthy Watersheds

"Under the section pertaining to inventorying healthy watersheds, there appears to be work pledged, and in some instances deadlines identified, [by several partners. However], there is no work pledged or evident on the work plan by [other partners] toward this objective."

...For the development of various vulnerability information under the strategy...there is only one state participating in data gathering and analysis... How can such a plan represent the combined best efforts to attain Blueprint objectives by 2025 if several states apparently are playing no role? More detail about timelines should be included in sections noted above.

Challenges

- Many commitments aren't captured in workplans

- Some workplans do not reflect the work that will happen at signatory level

- Some workplans cover more actions that the partnership can actually accomplish in the next two years (e.g. climate resiliency)

Comment Resolution

March 8-25 - GIT Review

March 25 – GITs send to MB for review and edits

April 14 – MB meeting

April 22 – MB comments to GITs; GITs incorporate edits

April 30 – Workplans final; post to CBP website