

CCMP Revision Subcommittee Meeting #3

RI Department of Environmental Management
235 Promenade Street, Room 300, Providence, Rhode Island
November 18, 2019
10:00am to 3:15pm

MEETING NOTES

Attendees

Rich Batiuk, CoastWise Partners
Veronica Berounsky, University of Rhode Island/RI Rivers Council
Laura Blake, Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP)
Peter Coffin, Blackstone River Coalition
Caitlin Chaffee, RI Coastal Resource Management Council (CRMC)
Peiter de Jong, Blackstone River Coalition
Alicia Eichinger, Salt Ponds Coalition
Ron Entringer, [affiliation?]
Richard Friesner, New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission (NEIWPC)
Walt Galloway, RI Rivers Council
Paul Gonsalves, RI Department of Administration, Division of Statewide Planning
Holly Greening, CoastWise Partners
Dave Janik, MA Office of Coastal Zone Management
Sue Kiernan, Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management (RIDEM)
Regina Lyons, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 1 (EPA)
Ken Payne, Systems Aesthetics LLC/Rhode Island Agricultural Partnership/Charlestown Citizens Alliance
Heidi Ricci, Mass Audubon
Sue Sullivan, NEIWPC
Tom Uva, Narragansett Bay Commission
Caitlyn Whittle, EPA
Julia Bancroft, Narragansett Bay Estuary Program (NBEP)
Mike Gerel, NBEP
Courtney Schmidt, NBEP
Julia Twichell, NBEP

Introduction

Mike Gerel called the meeting to order at 10:05am and asked everyone to introduce themselves. With a motion and a second the notes from the September 11th CCMP Subcommittee meeting were approved. An NBEP PowerPoint for the meeting is provided along with these notes.

CoastWise Partners Presentation and Discussion

The day started with presentations by Rich Batiuk and Holly Greening with CoastWise Partners. The talks and subsequent discussion offered invaluable insights and nuggets of information. Therefore, we have done our best to capture the conversation as they occurred in the following two subsections. Readers are encouraged to consult the written materials provided by each speaker to view a more exact presentation of their thoughts.

Rich Batiuk's Talk

Rich Batiuk with CoastWise Partners, the former Associate Director for Science, Analysis, and implementation for the Chesapeake Bay Program shared his thoughts on what was behind recent success in the Chesapeake Bay cleanup. Rich handed out a 2-pp document titled, *Lessons Learned from Putting 18 Million Chesapeake Bay Watershed Residents on a Strict Bay Pollution Diet*, which is provide along with these notes. Highlights from his presentation and the ensuing discussion are provided below:

- Invest early and often in stakeholder/outreach. Most important thing you will do and very time consuming. Are people have a voice at the table and are they being heard should be a priority. Need enough people at the table to feel like to you have genuine buy-in from the region. They talked to literally thousands of farmers. The public access issue also brought in more partners—Depts of Ed, Park Service, and EF folks.
- Focus on partnership. People respond to fellowship and connections to others. Do your very best make major decisions as a partnership and be transparent about how decisions are made. Decisions made by partners/community are more likely to result in action. They ended up with more partners than staff could deal with, so be systematic about partnership-building.
- Have a solid science foundation to rise about the weeds of uncertainty that are always present.
- Have an end goal in mind first—use simple, measurable, and achievable goals that people can buy into hundreds of miles upstream.
- Include an adequate amount of specificity in plans so the why, where, who, and when is clear so there is a road map for NBEP and its to know what is really needed. Vague plans to work.
- Simple, meaningful goals (drill down on a handful, not 15 or 20) that can be attained are recommended: quality over quantity. The most recent Chesapeake Bay Agreement had 6 goals and 37 actions. Mike promised to share a copy of the most recent agreement to which Rich is referring.
- Agreements/plans are not just a piece of paper, they must be commitments.
- TMDL did bring in the regulatory piece and justification for pollution allocations at the local level; the implementation tact was to have locals determine actions and frame as how can their community be more successful at meeting its needs, be more productive, etc.
- Review proposed actions to assure they have a clear ‘purpose,’ in that they are tied to a goal in your CCMP.
- Build adaptability into your plan so it can react to change from its early development through implementation. Consider a mid-point check-in and intern targets to spur reaction to progress and new circumstances.
- Follow progress on implementation and report it. It takes time set metrics, track, and report out but it is worth it.
- Build a schedule—they used 2-year, week-by-week schedule for TMDL development: partner engagement, key decision points, important drafting deadlines.
- Suggests using a term other than CCMP to describe your plan.
- Messaging is critical:
 - Bay pollution diet, like too many cheeseburgers.
 - Present as a benefit to all, not another burden. Everyone can benefit from partnership effort.
 - If you can tell a digestible and compelling story with your CCMP and associated outreach (keep to high points that connect with people) you can make a difference.
 - Think 10 slides, 10 minutes that can be understood by non-experts.
 - Build out from water quality to other issues.
 - Messages include, we are working on your behalf (the Governor, NGO, and you!); clean drinking water (3 million people’s drinking water); livable cities that capture water for use,

less hazard; system is coming back; benefits the economy and ways of life (increased yield on farms, tourism, green marketing); and work to connect people with local places.

- Some key questions and answers coming out of the discussion after Rich's presentation were:
 - In response to a question whether the regulatory TMDL or partners/people were really the driver for progress on the Chesapeake Bay, Rich indicated that progress was made for 25 years through the partnership without the TMDL, just not enough. TMDL helped get the effort to the next level.
 - There is a perception that the Chesapeake Bay gets "all" the money and that has driven progress. Rich noted that they started with \$3M and then over time worked to leverage significant other federal, state, and private monies. He believes the money is there if you have simple, understandable goals that funders can connect to. They need to become part of the story. Foundation money was a huge win. You earn that money as it takes time to cultivate and you must deliver results because of so many other competing priorities. It was noted that between SNEP, the Massachusetts Municipal Vulnerability Preparedness Program, RI Infrastructure Bank, and private foundations in our study there are significant dollars already coming here, which could be better counted, coordinated, and used to leverage new sources. A follow-up question was how the Bay clean-up specifically engaged private foundation. Rich noted that the Chesapeake Bay Funders Network was a big help. The network is a group of 22 very small to large private foundations serving the region that come together to jointly solicit and select projects. It also came back to the partnership, where partners from across the area brought their local funding connections to bear for their watersheds *and* the Bay.
 - Another question was how the Bay Program engaged with farmers. He noted that it took thousands of meetings with farm interests. The state associations of Conservation Districts also helped, and the local Farm Bureaus bought into the effort (even as the national chapter was in a lawsuit opposing the TMDL). His suggestion for those who work the land and water is to start hyper-local with the right people and build out. Must tell the story about how local actions and reactions impact the larger system—from headwaters to sea and back. It was noted the Chesapeake Bay Foundation's (CBF) *Farmer-to-the-Bay* and *Waterman-to-the-Valley* trips as emblematic of that approach.
 - Responding to a further question about how they addressed short capacity to execute such a massive endeavor, Rich noted that they focused on a more modest set of actions, brought in more partners to boost capacity, and focused on issues that were important to local people.
 - There was a question whether the Bay clean up was tied to economic benefits. Rich said absolutely that the clean-up was presented not as an economic benefit not a cost burden. Mike added while he was working for them CBF completed a study that concluded that after implementation of the TMDL the watershed will provide annual benefits of \$130B per year, an increase in \$22B per year (without the TMDL the benefits provided declined by \$6B per year).

Holly Greening Talk

Holly Greening with CoastWise Partners, the former Director of the Tampa Bay National Estuary Program (TBEP) shared her experience with the CCMP revision process. She offered a 15-pp presentation titled, *Insights and Suggestions from a CCMP Revision Survivor* and a copy of TBEP's CCMP revision, which are provided along with these notes. Here are some key take homes from her talk:

- She views the CCMP as a focused 10-year community blueprint that provides consensus priority actions necessary for estuary restoration and protection.
- Her advice was to strive for less than 50 actions.
- The plan should be used to guide annual work plans, which will include the tasks necessary to accomplish the actions called out in the CCMP.

- Holly advised to focus at the local level to keep interest up and then tie local actions together across the watershed to form the plan.
- She offered that mapping out the plan development process early with what would be completed, by whom, and when would be very helpful.
- She highly suggested conducting a simple opinion poll early on to gauge community perceptions and interests. Some highlights on polling included:
 - Non-EPA funds were used to avoid OMB issues. A partner advocacy group conducted their survey. She noted this was not a formal survey that was statistically valid; however, NBEP could do a formal poll if deemed useful.
 - A poll can be used to gauge public perception of the health of the estuary, surface misunderstandings/misinformation, identify concerns and solutions that resonate with the public, and attract those that may want to support action (e.g., partners, funders, volunteers).
 - Holly suggested attending meetings of local interests to collect information before writing poll questions. Focus groups were also utilized.
 - The target audience wasn't "everyone on the street," but those that already have knowledge or interest in the Bay.
 - TBEP and partners used social media and emails to get the poll out (asked partners to send poll link to 5 people outside usual groups).
 - Holly shared an idea for some Narragansett Bay questions to include:
 - Identify the ways enjoy the Bay.
 - Do you think water quality has gotten better, worse, or stayed the same?
 - What is the biggest threat to the watershed's health today and in 10 years?
 - How pessimistic or optimistic are you about the health of the Bay getting better?
 - The response rate was about 25%. Found people were interested in stormwater and climate.
 - Ken Payne suggested that private foundations can fund professional polling that if done right creates high quality data that diverse interests can rely on to make business and policy decisions.
 - Mike stated that he would like to hire a firm to complete formal polling to gauge what NBEP should pursue via its annual work plans, and potentially, test different messages about the task to pursue in our work plan. He felt funding such a poll with Section 320 funds was consistent with the recent legal determination NBEP received from EPA last Fall. He will talk to Caitlyn at EPA whether such a poll, if fully consistent with ICR Reference # 201705-2040-001, would be permitted with NBEP's 320 funds.
- Holly noted these support documents were key to their CCMP revision:
 1. CCMP Revision Roadmap. She strongly suggested getting written agreement from EPA on a "roadmap" at the very beginning the revision process. TBEP inserted their responses to each required step right into the 2015 EPA CCMP Guidelines. This approach will protect NBEP should the requirements change during CCMP development.
 2. 10-year budget. Mike noted he would like to determine a "value" generated by the plan/value of clean watershed to put the budgeted cost in proper context.
 3. Finance Plan for paying for plan implementation.
 4. Outreach Plan for engaging folks in the CCMP development and implementation.
 5. Monitoring Plan for progress against the CCMP actions.
 6. Detailed timeline. She suggested using a large roll of paper and having the stakeholders help build out the timeline with key decisions, events, and deadlines.
- Mike noted that NBEP's plan is to bring a revision roadmap and timeline to the next CCMP Subcommittee for review and discussion.
- Holly next talked about the process used to develop the plan. TBEP used a rolling process to develop a set of 5-7 actions every 6 months. This number of actions was all the partnership could handle at

one time. The process took about 3 years to complete and resulted in 38 actions. Here is a link to the TBEP CCMP: <https://indd.adobe.com/view/cf7b3c48-d2b2-4713-921c-c2a0d4466632>. The 6-month maps out as follows:

1. In months 1-2, staff took a first stab at drafting actions, including review of past and addition of new actions.
 - Someone inquired how TBEP picked their “buckets” of actions. For example, were all 5 actions in a block related to water quality? Holly responded that they included a mix of actions across issues and ease of development. She suggested starting with some easier ones first. In response to another question about aspirational actions, Holly noted that TBEP only included actions that the program or partners knew could be completed. Overall, she felt that going through the blocks of actions was a good way to engage people in the process.
 - She next offered some specific thoughts on EPA’s requirement to record the current status of actions in the existing CCMP. She suggested using consistent numbering/language that would enable future tracking of actions as they are completed, changed, are combined, etc. in the future. TBEP did a lot of merging, while still retaining the specificity of each action, sometimes by converting actions to tasks under another encompassing action. She also encouraged NBEP to celebrate completed actions by including successes in the opening section of the CCMP.
 - Mike noted that this group will be taking a first stab of reviewing the existing actions later today. Further, NBEP staff also plan to work up and share with the subcommittee a simple matrix of goals, objectives, and actions in the next two months to stimulate a more forward-looking discussion at the next subcommittee meeting in March.
 2. In month 3-4, draft actions were sent to TBEP’s advisory committees and EPA with a request for written comments.
 3. In month 5, advisory committees and focus groups met to review action and comments and staff completed necessary revisions.
 4. In month 6, the management and policy boards offered review and conceptual approval.
 5. After all actions were conceptually, the full package was brought to the management conference and EPA for formal approval.
- She shared the following about NEP staffing and consultants:
 - Dedicating specialized TBEP staff to manage the technical, logistical, financial, etc. parts of the process, and otherwise heard cats and keep things on schedule was essential.
 - A science writer (at \$25K) to research and complete the first draft of each action plan.
 - A graphic designer (at \$30K) to put together a visually compelling on-line document and printable summary.
 - In response to a question, Holly noted that they used some Section 320 funds for consultants, and other non-320 funds from EPA. Region Lyons noted that a NEP competitive grant program will be rolling out in Fall 2020, which will a funding option for NEPs pursuing CCMPs this year.
 - Holly noted that it is impossible for the NEP staff to complete the whole process—you are going to need help.
 - She suggested formatting for on-line release
 - People use the on-line versions of the CCMP vastly more often than paper these days. It is cheaper and allows more color, graphics, photos, maps, stories, and overall visual creativity.
 - Holly like the idea of a graphic timeline as a public engagement tool that shows the history of the watershed up to and through the new 10-year plan. Suggested using local meetings to see what history comes from their place.
 - A pdf of the on-line document can be created to formally submit to EPA.
 - Including a 10-pp hard-copy summary in paper that can be easily understood distributed is also a worthwhile tool.

- Some key questions and answers coming out after Holly’s presentation included:
 - It was asked what she would do differently? She responded that keeping the number of actions per quarter to five, stretching out the timeline, avoiding aspirational staff as actions (can be in the background or other components of program), and emphasizing to all that the CCMP is the most critical document the NEP will do for the forthcoming 10 years.
 - Next, someone inquired how they narrowed their actions from over 100+ in their previous CCMP? Staff kept keeping the number at around 50 through the process, some actions upon review were better suited as tasks under an action, some actions were combined, and they kept to only including actions where there was a responsible party and funding source. Mike noted that the having a funding source identified was a good criterion for NBEP to consider for including an individual action in the plan—the money doesn’t have to be in hand—just viable sources called out. With such an addition, NBEP’s preliminary criteria for including an action in the CCMP would be: (1) it is consistent with NBEP’s mission, (2) it has the consensus support of the subcommittee, (3) can be completed in 10 years, (4) an entity has committed to pursue it, and (5) at least one viable funding source for implementing it has been identified.
 - In response to a question about monitoring CCMP progress, she said they took a full look every five years and a full revision ever 10.
 - Another question was what level of feedback did TBEP get from EPA? Kept EPA Region staff involved in the quarterly action development, but also kept EPA HQ informed as they have to approve the document in the end.
 - Holly clarified that the opinion polling and early part of the revision were conducted simultaneously.
 - Responding to a question on outreach, Holly stated that TBEP staff developed materials to share with specific stakeholders (for example, homeowners associations were key around fertilizer use on lawns).
 - Another question was whether any participants came in late? Holly said there were some, but overall, it was a constant education process for all involved as new information arrived and the document was constructed. They did have to offer more context for those coming in later to the process, so try to anticipate who must be in on the details early (e.g., partners) and who can come in later (e.g., agency director, higher-level elected officials).

CCMP Revision Audience

NBEP staff led a rapid session to discuss audiences for the CCMP. The intent was twofold—to help determine who should be get involved in the CCMP development process and who will ultimately use and benefit from the document. Meeting participants were split into two groups and asked to list potential audiences for the revision. For each audience, the groups identified the purpose of reaching them, the best way to reach them, when to reach them, and potential messages for connecting with them. The small groups then reported out to the full group. NBEP staff will roll up the results and look to invite new folks to future meetings and build engagement with any new audiences into the CCMP Revision timeline to be developed. Feedback and discussion highlights reported out from the two groups during this session are offered below:

- We are not seeking to reach the “general public.” NBEP should be more targeted and focus on those that have a stake or interest in the health and resilience of the watershed. The “interested public” can be the focus.
- Goal of outreach should be that people leave with a greater understanding of the dynamic, complex, and adaptive system that are play in watersheds, what is the value of doing the plan, and how they can help and how it helps them.
- Need to always be looking to create “social learning” opportunities—with education can come a greater willingness to engage and act.

- We will need a core group that “gets it” to help us develop, share, and implement the plan.
- Connecting with local ambassadors or champions should be a priority.
- Students and environmental educators are another important audience. Kids are our future.
- We also must engage with industry groups directly impacted by plan. Remember that 1 in 10 jobs in the region are associated with natural resources. These people have a direct interest in the outcome of the plan and related efforts.
- The term “partners” was favored over audiences to emphasize that we are not talking at people, but actively listening and responding to what they are saying.
- Need to ensure meaningful engagement, fair treatment, and transparency as we reach out. The Ocean SAMP process would be a good model for us. See http://www.crmc.ri.gov/samp_ocean.html.
- Should focus on the economic/job impacts of the CCMP. There is huge interest in this aspect of the watershed so this is where the energy will come from.
- An observation was made that the subcommittee should define the goals before identifying audiences or attempting to craft messages. This was a fair point. This session was intended as a preliminary means to capture missing stakeholders that should join us soon *and* call out potential audiences for this work. On the flipside, it was also stated that the topline goals are unlikely to change much, but actions and metrics will. Delaying audience-specific messaging made sense to both groups.
- It was concluded that once we have more fully formed goals and actions we can circle back and define specific audiences, consider best messages for each, and go to them to public to see what goals and actions are missing, how partners will benefit, and how they can help.
- Bottom line is that we all must be able to simply say what the CCMP is and what it aims to do. We also want to create awareness of what information and services are available for folks to both help implement the plan, but more importantly, address their local issues.
- NBEP will develop and share with the subcommittee a list of new partners that includes the how, how, and when of engaging with them.

Which Actions in the 2012 CCMP Update Are Still Relevant?

Mike next led a group discussion to identify the 119 actions included in the 2012 CCMP Update that have been completed, can be combined, are no longer relevant, or should be considered for inclusion in the 2022 CCMP Revision. Mike also shared that at the last CCMP Subcommittee meeting the group discussed which high priority actions had been completed. These actions are marked with a green check in a series of PPT slides. Making status determinations about the actions in the 2012 plan was challenging since many were broad, vague, and/or unclear. Further some actions are never ‘complete,’ and are more ongoing by their nature. This exercise provided a good reminder to be as specific and clear as possible in the new plan so actions can more be readily understood, implemented, and progress tracked.

Participants persevered and walked through the 2012 document to provide their best assessment. The results of this discussion are summarized in the table on the next four pages. In general, the outcome desired by many actions will carry forward in some way, with revision to add specificity, prioritize/narrow, or combine with other actions to reduce redundancy. Those actions designated as “Keep As Is” will be rolled into the 2022 plan as of now. The intent of the “Consider Keep and Revise” or “Started/Ongoing” actions will be considered for the new plan.

Bottom line is that this process and the 2012 plan were viewed as minimally informative for future work. To meet EPA requirements, staff will go through the table below and provide a status for each and include a final assessment with the 2022 plan.

CCMP Update 2012 Action Preliminary Assessment

Action	Complete	Started/Ongoing	Not Started	Keep As Is	Consider Keep and Revise	Remove	Notes
Goal 1—Protect and Restore Clean Water							
<i>Objective 1: Reduce pollution from wastewater sources</i>							
1.1	X						
1.2	X						
1.3	X						
1.4		X			X		Revise to add specificity about target areas, technology, etc.
1.5			X			X	Too broad and based on hyper-local conditions.
1.6			X			X	Viewed as a too hyper-local.
1.7		X			X		Revise to add specific about target areas for monitoring and repair.
1.8		X			X		Revise to add specificity about when such a requirement would apply.
<i>Objective 2: Reduce pollution from stormwater sources</i>							
2.1		X			X		
2.2		X			X		Identify priority areas.
2.3		X					
2.4							Combine with others in this subsection.
2.5	X				X		Completed and revise for next plan, perhaps combined with others.
2.6	X				X		Laws in place, now need to implement.
2.7					X		Too broad. Add specificity.
2.8	X				X		Move on to implementation.
2.9						X	State-specific policy issue that is not appropriate for this plan.
2.10		X					
<i>Objective 3: Reduce pollution form combined sewer overflows</i>							
3.1	X						
3.2	X						
3.3					X		Combine with stormwater/LID action(s) under Objective 2.
<i>Objective 4: Manage estuaries, rivers, streams, and lakes to prevent degradation and restore beneficial uses</i>							
4.1			X				Refine to be more specific, perhaps connected to beneficial uses.
4.2		X			X		
4.3		X			X		Combine with other local capacity-building action.
4.4		X		X			
4.5			X				A groundwater quality and quantity related action is likely needed.
<i>Objective 5: Improve funding for water quality and quantity improvement and for resource assessment and monitoring</i>							
5.1					X		Combine with other local capacity action(s).
5.2					X		Combine into one action that advocates or necessary funding for plan.
5.3					X		Combine into one action that advocates or necessary funding for plan.
5.4					X		Combine into one action that advocates or necessary funding for plan.
5.5					X		Roll into other local capacity-building action(s).

CCMP Update 2012 Action Preliminary Assessment

Action	Complete	Started/Ongoing	Not Started	Keep As Is	Consider Keep and Revise	Remove	Notes
5.6					X		Roll into other local capacity-building action(s).
5.7		X		X			Consider rolling into a priority septic action.
5.8		X					Consider rolling into a priority septic action.
<i>Objective 6: Improve information, science, and analysis that support management efforts necessary to restore and protect fresh and salt waters</i>							
6.1		X			X		Refine to create one priority data collection, analysis and sharing action.
6.2		X			X		Refine to create one priority data collection, analysis and sharing action.
6.3		X			X		Refine to create one priority data collection, analysis and sharing action.
6.4		X			X		Refine to create one priority data collection, analysis and sharing action.
6.5		X			X		Refine to create one priority data collection, analysis and sharing action.
Goal 2--Manage Land for Conservation and Community							
<i>Objective 1: Implement low impact development</i>							
1.1		X			X		Some jurisdictions have adopted LID standards. Combine with other SWM.
1.2		X			X		Combine with other SWM.
1.3			X			X	Specific to states and municipalities. Could roll into an advocacy action.
<i>Objective 2: Preserve open space and natural systems</i>							
2.1	X	X			X		Completed in RI; ongoing in MA.
2.2		X			X		Included as part of a land protection action.
2.3						X	Could roll into an advocacy action.
<i>Objective 3: Develop and use incentives and local zoning requirements that support compact, mixed-use walkable communities</i>							
3.1			X		X		Include as part of an environmental justice (EJ) focused policy action.
3.2						X	Could roll into an advocacy action.
3.3					X		Combine with local capacity action(s).
3.4						X	Too broad and beyond the scope of this plan.
<i>Objective 4: Increase and maintain regional recreational opportunities and public access to shorelines and waterfronts</i>							
4.1					X		Can be rolled into an equitable public access action.
4.2					X		Can be rolled into an equitable public access action.
4.3					X		Can be rolled into an equitable public access action.
4.4					X		Can be rolled into an equitable public access action.
4.5					X		Can be rolled into an equitable public access action. Focus on uplands good.
<i>Objective 5: Improve science, information, and communication to support effective land use management</i>							
5.1		X				X	Too broad as written.
5.2			X		X		Assessing cumulative actions should be considered for the next plan.
<i>Objective 6: Increase the role of watershed organizations and municipalities to serve critical partners in watershed management</i>							
6.1		X			X		Include within a local capacity-building action.
6.2		X			X		Include within a local capacity-building action.
6.3			X			X	Too specific for this plan.
6.4			X				
6.5			X	X			Still relevant.

CCMP Update 2012 Action Preliminary Assessment

Action	Complete	Started/Ongoing	Not Started	Keep As Is	Consider Keep and Revise	Remove	Notes
6.6				X			Include within a local capacity action, or a more specific coordination action.
6.7					X		Include within a local capacity-building action.
Goal 3: Protection and Restore Fish, Wildlife, and Habitats							
<i>Objective 1: Conserve existing natural landscapes that have been and will be adversely affected by development, climate change, and invasive species</i>							
1.1					X		Focus on priority areas.
1.2						X	Replace with a local coordination action.
<i>Objective 2: Restore degraded or lost habitat functions</i>							
2.1		X			X		This should be a priority in the new plan.
2.2						X	This plan intends to serve this purpose.
2.3	X					X	We are beyond assessment. Now adapt and remove.
<i>Objective 3: Manage habitats to sustain and enhance habitat function</i>							
3.1						X	Not moving forward.
3.2	X						Completed in 2013.
3.3						X	Intent of this action unclear.
3.4		X			X		Include in priority data acquisition action.
3.5						X	Refine into priority monitoring action.
3.6						X	Refine into priority monitoring action.
3.7		X			X		Focus on inland cold water fisheries is a need.
<i>Objective 4: Monitor, control, and prevent terrestrial and aquatic invasive species</i>							
4.1			X		X		An action that includes the species and where would make a good action.
<i>Objective 5: Improve science, communication, and information to guide management of habitat and biodiversity</i>							
5.1	X						Done by NBEP in 2017.
5.2	X						Department created.
5.3		X			X		Too general.
5.4			X		X		This action should be a priority moving forward.
5.5		X			X		A cross-discipline priority research action will be needed.
5.6			X				Could be part of more thorough review of cumulative impacts.
5.7		X			X		Completed for priority areas in MA. Need to complete for RI and join data.
5.8		X					Would need to be more specific.
5.9			X				Unsure if regional advocacy groups are interested in this approach.
5.10		X			X		Creating an adaptable estuary model should be a very high priority by 2032.
5.11			X				NRCS/Soil and Water District programs track. Need to check data sharing.
<i>Objective 6: Build capacity to implement ecological restoration at state and local levels and improve interstate coordination</i>							
6.1			X			X	Expertise remains within DEM, CRMC, and other agencies and academics.
6.2	X	X			X		Combine with other SWM/LID action(s).
6.3						X	Roll into suite of advocacy actions called for by NGOs that lobby.
6.4			X		X		Mapping of priority areas for restoration and protection is good idea.
6.5						X	Too broad.

CCMP Update 2012 Action Preliminary Assessment

Action	Complete	Started/Ongoing	Not Started	Keep As Is	Consider Keep and Revise	Remove	Notes
6.6		X			X		No stable funding. Good for NBEP to consider now and in plan.
6.7			X	X			This is a gap that NBEP and others should address, especially HABs.
Goal #4: Manage Climate Change Impacts to Natural Systems							Note that climate change actions will not be a standalone action in the 2022 plan but will be integrated within each goal moving forward.
<i>Objective 1: Maximize preservation, conservation, and restoration of green infrastructure to increase coastal and floodplain resilience</i>							
1.1		X			X		Too broad as written.
1.2		X			X		Needs to be more specific.
1.3						X	The basis for this action is unknown.
1.4		X			X		Definite priority. Very broad as written—add specificity.
<i>Objective 2: Improve public and private infrastructure to withstand anticipated climate change impacts</i>							
2.1		X			X		Some strategies in place. Refine for the new plan based on what's in place.
2.2							Data, designs and, policies in place; need to implement.
2.3		X		X			This is an ongoing priority.
2.4					X		Broad.
2.5					X		Can be included in a planning action.
2.6			X	X			Important action to pursue.
<i>Objective 3: Ensure adequate disaster mitigation and response planning to protect life and built environment</i>							
3.1	X						Completed.
3.2						X	Outside scope of plan. More emergency-response oriented.
3.3		X			X		Add specifics about which systems and structures.
3.4						X	Too broad.
<i>Objective 4: Develop funding mechanisms for improve preparedness and response</i>							
4.1		X			X		Combine into funding needs action(s).
4.2			X		X		Combine into funding needs action(s).
4.3					X		Combine into funding needs action(s).
4.4						X	
4.5		X			X		Combine with research needs identification and implementation action(s).
<i>Objective 5: Improve science and information necessary for preparedness and response</i>							
5.1		X			X		Completed as written. Revise to incorporate models that combine sea level rise, storm surge, and river flow.
5.2					X		Combine with research needs action(s).
5.3					X		What LiDAR data is available and what has it been used for?
<i>Objective 6: Ensure that coastal habitat restoration and conservation efforts take sea level rise into account</i>							
6.1		X			X		Build into a priority planning action.
6.2		X			X		Combine with other research needs action(s).
6.3		X				X	Redundant with other actions.

Identification of Existing Plans and Assessments

There was not enough time to pursue this agenda item. NBEP staff will provide a list of existing plans and assessments for discussion at the next subcommittee meeting.

Set 2020 CCMP Subcommittee Meeting Dates

Mike indicated that NBEP would like to pick state, date, and time for the CCMP Subcommittee meetings already planned for February, April, June, August, October, and December 2020. It was suggested that the meetings alternate between RI and MA, as well mix up the venues to keep the group refreshed. Mike noted that NBEP Executive Committee meetings were already scheduled for the second Tuesday of each month, and the full Steering Committee on the fourth Wednesday of each month. Two participants stated that Tuesdays early in the month are not good. Mike suggested for the sake of time that we consider Mondays or Thursdays. He obligated to get back to folks with a schedule.

Subsequent to the meeting NBEP set the CCMP Subcommittees for 2020 on the third Thursday of the month as described in the table below. Specific locations for out months will be provided as scheduling restrictions at venues allow.

2020 NBEP CCMP Subcommittee Meeting Schedule

Date/Time	Location	Address
Thursday, February 20, 2020, 10am-3pm	RI	TBD
Thursday, April 16, 2020, 10am-3pm	Blackstone Heritage Corridor Visitor Center	3 Paul Clancy Way Worcester, MA 01607
Thursday, June 18, 2020, 10am-3pm	RI	TBD
Thursday, August 20, 2020, 10am-3pm	MA	TBD
Thursday, October 15, 2020, 10am-3pm	RI	TBD
Thursday, December 17, 2020, 10am-pm	MA	TBD

Next Steps

1. Subcommittee members should review the notes and provide any edits to Mike by March 20th.
2. Mike will provide to the subcommittee a copy of the 2014 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement ASAP.
3. Mike will include the following documents along with these notes:
 - a. Mike's subcommittee PPT.
 - b. *Lessons Learned from Putting 18 Million Chesapeake Bay Watershed Residents on a Strict Bay Pollution Diet.*
 - c. *Insights and Suggestions from a CCMP Revision Survivor PPT.*
4. NBEP staff will develop a suite of CCMP revision development draft support documents, including a roadmap, goals-objectives-action category matrix, new stakeholder document, and revised timeline and provide to the subcommittee prior to the next meeting
5. Mike will talk to Caitlyn at EPA whether Section 320 funds can be used to hire a firm to conduct a formal opinion poll.
6. NBEP staff will go through the 2012 actions reviewed in the preliminary evaluation to prepare a cleaner and more final assessment for subcommittee review in 2020.

The meeting adjourned at 3:40pm.