Enhancing Partnering, Leadership and Management Goal Implementation Team
Strategy Review System revision comments

GIT6 Members – General Comments

- **Dave Goshorn (MD DNR, GIT6 Chair)/Carin Bisland (EPA)** – One of the problems is that we don't have a trajectory, nor a way to quantify the actions of the workplan to see if we are on that trajectory. We will need this to be able to do the type of reviews we are talking about. That's why we shouldn't just ask whether we are doing what we said we would do, but also if it is having the expected effect on the outcome. We need to make improvements to workplans and management strategies to develop shorter milestones that lead in a trajectory to the longer term outcome.

- **Dave Goshorn (MD DNR, GIT6 Chair)** – I think we need to "take it the next step," and quantify who will do what. If our collective 2025 goal is to open 1,000 miles of fish passage, then we need to identify how much MD, VA, PA, etc. will do by 2025 that adds up to 1,000 miles. I am hoping that this process will make it clear to all that we have little hope of reaching these goals if we don't commit soon.

- **Carin Bisland (EPA)** – In my mind, what is still missing from this is a flow chart. The reason I think we need a flow chart is that what we are defining here is a slice out of the whole organizational flow. This process doesn't describe what a workgroup or GIT does before the quarterly meetings, nor does it describe what happens to the information FROM the process.

- **Greg Barranco (EPA)** – The reporting timeline for *ChesapeakeProgress* is a good discussion topic for the PSC. To get accurate updates on workplan progress, the GITs would need to make data calls/ask the jurisdictions for reports. Under the current SRS plan, we'd only have progress updates in time for the 2-day Biennial Reviews in Jan., or in time for their "block progress meetings" (which would basically be every two years per grouping).

  As an alternative, I'd like to suggest we add a mid-cycle "Progress Report". We'd ask the GITs/jurisdictions to report back on workplan progress by **Nov. each year** (at the **same time as the CBARA reporting**). In those alternate years, we'd ask for a simple dashboard status report (red/yellow/green) for each item in their workplan.
  So, for the PSC, we'd want their buy in for reporting as follows:
  - Annually, in November (with CBARA info) a simple status update, dashboard style (red/yellow/green) for work plans
  - Alternating years, in November, same as above with additional information as prep for the 2-day Biennial Review
  - Every two years – for each outcome's progress "block" meeting--more detailed information as it relates to implementation of each *management strategy* (as spelled out as part of the decision framework).

GIT6 Member Comments – 2-Day Biennial Review meeting

- **Nicki Kasi (PA)** - From a strategic standpoint, the PSC should be the lead in the 2-day (Biennial Review) meeting. This is where they might want to set direction/prioritize. There may also be other options or roles they would prefer.

- **Carin Bisland (EPA)** – I don't have an objection related to PSC involvement in the 2-day meeting, but I thought, given they are State Secretaries and the Regional Administrator, they would benefit from the

completion of the assessments and the recommendations of the Management Board rather than participating in the Assessment themselves.

GIT6 Member Comments – Quarterly Progress Session meetings

- **Nicki Kasi (PA)** - I like the re-write, but am not sure I understand the inputs. There is some new language here – is there going to be some training of staff who will be held responsible for generating these materials, to ensure they understand what is expected of them? Or is this something that has been explained and only those new to the program need training on?

- **Nicki Kasi (PA)** – Highlight that this is where adaptive management can really happen.

- **Dave Goshorn (Chair)** – I am supportive of the "input" text, although I think the language needs to be revised to make more sense to those who will actually be implementing and filling this stuff out. This is what I want to spend some significant time discussing on Tuesday, Nov. 1.

- **Carin Bisland (EPA) –** One way that we can adjust the timeline is that, since the PSC has quarterly meetings, and since assessments will happen at the MB quarterly meetings, we may want to add PSC meetings 4-6 weeks after each of the MB quarterly reviews and have an agenda item on the results of those meetings.

GIT6 Member Comments – Progress Session meeting theme groupings/timeline

- **Greg Barranco (EPA)** – Like groupings in Option #1 better – more integrated. We can always make minor tweaks, and move WQ earlier or later (whatever makes the most sense with the two year milestones).

- **Nicki Kasi (PA)** – I like Option #2 better but can live with Option #1. Would prefer if the timing of Healthy Watersheds and Water Quality could be switched, so we aren't dealing with WQ right in front of having to write the Phase 3 WIP.

- **Nicki Kasi (PA)** – In Option #2, why the three-month instead of two-month gap in June 2017? There is a lot tied to the Headwater Story, but I don't have a better suggestion.

- **Catherine Krikstan (UMCES) –** Option #1 – one of the challenges to selecting an option lies in the fact that the priorities pushing the content of these meetings are competing with one another. I've heard three priorities mentioned, including: (a) grouping outcomes in order to tell a compelling story, (b) grouping outcomes in order to foster a timely discussion of recent indicator updates, and (c) grouping outcomes in order to bring together multiple GITs at multiple times of the year. It is difficult to give each of these priorities equal weight. I think the first and second are more important than the third, but this is a question that should be posed to the larger planning committee and/or the wider GIT.

  My suggested groupings are listed below (but their timing is in no particular order).

  Water Quality
  - 2017 and 2025 Watershed Implementation Plans (GIT3 | Spring Update)
  - Water Quality Standards Attainment and Monitoring (GIT3 | Summer Update)

  Toxic Contaminants
  - Toxic Contaminants Research (GIT3 | No indicator)
  - Toxic Contaminants Policy and Prevention (GIT3 | No indicator)

Local Land Use
- Land Use Options Evaluation (GIT4 | No indicator)
- Land Use Methods and Metrics Development (GIT4 | No indicator)
- Protected Lands (GIT5 | Late Fall Update)
- Tree Canopy (GIT2 | No indicator)
- Local Leadership (GIT6 | No indicator)

Rivers and Streams
- Healthy Watersheds (GIT4 | No indicator)
- Fish Passage (GIT2 | Fall Update)
- Forest Buffers (GIT2 | Later Summer Update)
- Stream Health (GIT2 | Winter Update)
- Brook Trout (GIT2 | No indicator)

Fish & Shellfish
- Blue Crab Abundance (GIT1 | Late Spring Update)
- Blue Crab Management (GIT1 | Mid-Summer Update)
- Oysters (GIT1 | Rolling Updates)
- Forage Fish (GIT1 | No indicator)
- Fish Habitat (GIT1 | No indicator)
- Submerged Aquatic Vegetation (GIT2 | Late Spring/Early Summer Update)

Stewardship
- Diversity (GIT5 | No indicator)
- Citizen Stewardship (GIT5 | No indicator)
- Public Access (GIT5 | Early Spring Update)

Next-Generation Stewards
- Environmental Literacy Planning (GIT5 | No indicator)
- Student (GIT5 | No indicator)
- Sustainable Schools (GIT5 | No indicator)

Climate Change & Resiliency
- Climate Adaptation (STAR | No indicator)
- Climate Monitoring and Assessment (STAR | No indicator)
- Wetlands (GIT2 | Fall Update)
- Black Duck (GIT2 | Spring Update)

Coordinator-Staffer Comments (Progress Session meeting theme groupings/timeline)

- **Kara Skipper (GIT1, Fisheries) –** I wanted to request clarification as to why forage was included under "Actions on Toxics" in Option 2. Was this aimed at drawing the connection of bioaccumulation of contaminants in larger fish? While I do see bioaccumulation as a potential connection, I think that forage would better fit with the following other outcomes:
  - **Blue Crab** - blue crabs serve as both forage and predators of forage depending on life stage
  - **SAV, Wetlands and Oysters** - forage species tend to live in shallow areas that can support SAV, marsh or oyster reefs

- **Climate** - The Chesapeake Atlantis Model found in its ecosystem-wide simulation that climate change effects (marsh loss and temperature increase) have strong effects on forage species, potentially more so than any other factor

- **Julie Mawhorter (GIT2, Habitat)** – Opposed to Scenario 2 – combining Tree Canopy with "Change and Resiliency" topics, very limited story connection there. Since Tree Canopy efforts are focused on local action/leadership and citizen stewardship, suggest combining with one or both of those to make them more cross-GIT; I think this would be a better story fit than under Healthy Watersheds which is more "headwaters" emphasis, and Tree Canopy is more urban.

- **Julie Mawhorter (GIT2, Habitat)** – Like Scenario 1 combining Forest Buffers into the WQ topic because it is the #2 relied upon BMP for achieving TMDL targets in the WIPs. It also gives the WQ topic a broader cross-GIT feel, because Forest Buffers are also critical for Habitat goals.

- **Julie Mawhorter (GIT2, Habitat)** – In general, it seems like a lot of important outcomes are being clumped under a Healthy Watersheds/Headwaters type theme. They are definitely related but I am concerned they will not get enough time/attention. In comparison, Toxics and Env. Literacy topics get a whole session, so that doesn't seem as equitable or Cross-GIT.

- **David Wood (GIT3, Water Quality)** – The groupings all look fine from my perspective. I don't know if you're this far down the road yet, but as far as timing, just keep in mind the key Midpoint Assessment dates for the MB.

- **Amy Handen (GIT5, Stewardship)** – Both versions are acceptable to the Stewardship Team. While the stewardship themes cover several GITs and workgroups, having them grouped together will enable robust discussion and feedback on our collective team efforts. While we know citizen stewardship will have an impact on all outcomes in the Agreement in the future, currently the efforts of citizen stewardship, public access, and diversity are more immediately related and interdependent.

- **Peter Tango (STAR)** – I see no deal breakers in Option 1. What I think is really important is that you have developed a 2-year plan, and you have a set of integrated meetings scheduled that captures all the groups/outcomes. It gives a structure and direction to the meeting schedule. I further believe that through the next two years, using this plan, we may see opportunities to tell other integrated stories as we work together and evolve our collective vision. I would expect a different set of groupings with different integrated title headings for 2019-2020. We should keep notes through the next two years on what is logical to have as "round 2" of integrated meetings.

- **Mary Gattis (LGAC)** – I prefer Option 2. My only question is why Fish Habitat is with Local Action? I would move that to either Change & Resiliency or Headwater Story. Tree Canopy (currently under Change & Resiliency) and Healthy Watersheds (currently under Headwater Story) would be better fit with Local Action. Stream Health (currently under Headwater Story) may fit better with Change & Resiliency.