

Table 1: Defining the Project and Outlining the Scope of Work

*The purpose of this table is to articulate a project idea to evaluate project necessity/relevancy and to strengthen project outcomes, steps, and deliverables. As you are developing your ideas, consider describing in your project justification section if the following three initiatives were incorporated: 1) Science, 2) Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Justice, and/or 3) Local Engagement.

<i>Item</i>	<i>Guidance</i>	<i>Response</i>
<u>Goal Implementation Team (GIT)</u>	As determined by the Chesapeake Bay Program.	Water Quality (or potentially Habitat)
<u>Project Priority #</u>	List the rank of this project in relation to other projects being submitted by the same GIT. Teams may submit up to four project ideas, each with a rank of 1-4.	
<u>CBPO Creative Team Component(s)</u> (Yes or No)	Does this project involve components that require input from the following functional areas: Web and Creative, GIS, Communications, and IT.	GIS support may be needed
<u>Proposed GIT Technical Project Lead</u>	If this project idea is selected to move forward for bid, the person identified as the GIT Technical Project Lead will be responsible for reviewing and recommending the selected contractor; this person will also review and approve the selected contractor's work for the duration of the project. GIT technical leads cannot be a part of the bidding team or financially be involved in the project. Provide the following for the GIT Lead: 1) First and Last Name, 2) Organization, and 3) email address.	Katie Brownson, US Forest Service, Katherine.brownson@usda.gov
<u>Preparers</u>	List names of all parties beyond the GIT lead who were part of developing the content of this table; list first the lead preparer (the point of contact for questions/clarification). These entities will not be allowed to bid on the scope of work during the Request for Proposals (RFP) stage. Provide the following for each Preparer: 1) First and Last Name, 2) Organization, and 3) email address.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Katie Brownson, USFS, Katherine.brownson@usda.gov • Sally Claggett, USFS, sally.claggett@usda.gov • Anne Hairston-Strang • Judy Okay • Frank Rodgers • Rebecca Hanmer
<u>Project Title</u> (10 words or less)	The title should be short and give a high-level view of what your project is trying to accomplish. Creative and catchy is fine only if it also captures the real purpose of your work. (Good Examples: "New Methods for Resilient Fish Ladder Design"; "Research and Database Creation for In-stream Litter Collection Devices"; "Development of Invasive Plant Management at Reforestation Sites").	Improving synergies between riparian forests and stream corridor restoration
<u>Project Type</u> <u>(check all that apply)</u>	<div> <u>Metric Development and Tracking Projects:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for science needed to develop metrics • Metric/indicator development • Performance measure development • Monitoring/tracking program development • Data collection program development </div> <div> <u>Logic and Action Plan Implementation Projects:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic modeling • Database development • Policy research and recommendations • Training • Mapping, lands assessment • Baseline analyses </div>	Policy research and recommendations; Mapping, lands assessment

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessments of data to evaluate progress on metrics • Modeling support • Other (please describe) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental monitoring • Environmental demonstration projects • Other (please describe) 	
<u>Proposed Outcomes</u>	<p>Outcomes are the changes you expect to see as a result of the work being completed. Examples of outcomes could be increased knowledge around how fish are changing habits/will change habits due to climate change; future fish ladders will be more successful due to readily available improved design standards; future fish passage policies will be reflective of resulting research.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identification of key leverage points in different jurisdictions where safeguards could be implemented to minimize the loss of riparian forest cover during stream restoration projects. This will contribute to an approach identified in the Forest Buffer Management Strategy to protect riparian forest buffers in local land use regulations, in this case, regulations specifically related to stream restoration. It will also contribute to an identified science need to establish guidelines and relationship between stream corridor restoration activities and functional lift to support project election, design, construction and monitoring to produce better stream health outcomes (Stream Health Outcome). - Improved understanding of the impacts stream restoration has had on riparian forest cover and the extent to which riparian forest cover recovers after stream restoration. This will contribute to the WQ GITs Management approach to “Develop improved understanding of the potential benefits, and risks, of selected practices and policies to provide benefits to multiple outcomes.” It will also contribute to an established science need to monitor forest buffer change using high-resolution data (Riparian Forest Buffer outcome).
<u>Justification</u> (500 words or less)	<p>This is your elevator speech - why is this work important to the over-arching goals? Why is it important to the other GITs? How does this work build on previous work? Be succinct in your answer.</p>		<p>With the growing interest and implementation of stream restoration practices in the watershed, there is concern about the implications of these practices to existing forest buffers. Forest buffers can improve stream health by providing shade to lower stream temperatures, filtering nutrients and sediments from runoff, and contributing organic material that provides a foundation for aquatic food webs. While qualifying conditions outlined in the expert panel report for stream restoration BMPs offer some protection for riparian vegetation, there is evidence that these conditions have not been consistently met. By changing the hydrology, wetlands may also be impacted (or created) as a result of stream restoration. Some newer stream restoration project designs are seeking to restore riparian ecosystems to historic open wetland meadow conditions, which may result in the loss of thermal refugia for coldwater species like brook trout.</p> <p>Because there are large goals for stream restoration, wetlands, and forest buffers in state Watershed Implementation Plans and the 2014 Bay Agreement, it is imperative to better synergize our efforts and</p>

		<p>investments to minimize trade-offs. A cross-GIT project involving the Urban Stormwater, Stream Health, Wetlands and Forestry Workgroups could take a comprehensive look at how trees have been accounted for, or not, at multiple stages of stream restoration:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Project planning- How are forests considered in the site selection process? What tree inventory requirements are in place and how are these inventories used in project planning? How are jurisdictions engaging forestry agencies in the planning process? What are the requirements for post-restoration planting? 2. Permitting- How are existing forests addressed in permits for stream restoration projects? How are jurisdictions engaging forestry agencies in the permitting process? How are permits enforced and who is responsible for enforcement? 3. Implementation- What impact has stream restoration had on riparian forest cover and wetlands? What happens to the trees once removed? How are any unforeseen issues or discrepancies between project design and implementation handled? 4. Post-restoration- To what extent are trees being re-planted after the restoration is complete? To what extent are trees being lost due to the restoration-driven alterations in the hydrologic regime? What site maintenance is conducted after restoration? Who is responsible for monitoring? To what extent is riparian tree cover restored after restoration and how quickly does this occur? <p>This work could be accomplished by a literature and policy review, interviews, and pursuing document trails from recent stream restoration work. Spatial analysis of a subset of the watershed using new high-resolution land use change and hydrography datasets could also be used to quantify the impacts stream restoration has had on forest buffers and the extent and speed with which riparian tree cover is recovered post-restoration.</p> <p>A resulting report would recommend ways to better incentivize practices that will minimize unintended adverse outcomes to riparian forests and identify opportunities for coupling these BMPs so they can work together for water quality and habitat improvements.</p>
--	--	---

<u>Proposed Project Steps and Timeline (up to 8 maximum)</u>	List all of the major steps required to accomplish the project goals. Make sure to include any meetings with GIT teams and other relevant stakeholders (try to quantify meetings; a step to review draft deliverables by relevant stakeholders; and a step for the contractor to refine the deliverables after draft review. Indicate whether the methods by which a contractor will be expected to undertake the work are well known or whether you intend for the bidders to propose the methodology. Assume that work will start March 2021.	
<u>Estimated Costs</u>	Provide an estimate of the project cost (generally \$25,000-\$75,000). Estimating accurate budgets can be a challenge. Some tips to improve budget accuracy: to start, estimate number of the hours and other costs like supplies and travel that it would take <i>YOU</i> to accomplish each of the steps identified above. Keep in mind that contractors can range from \$50-150 an hour (when indirect costs are factored in). Don't forget to include the time it would take for the contractor to attend any meetings. Finally, don't forget to account for contractor time to revise final products to incorporate stakeholder feedback.	
<u>Cross-Goal Benefits</u>	List any cross-goal benefits succinctly	Habitat- Both the wetlands and the stream health workgroup are interested in identifying ways to improve the habitat outcomes of stream restoration; Healthy Watersheds