



Long Island Sound Study Management Committee Meeting Sign-in Sheet: October, 2015

Name	Organization
Susy King	NEIWPCC
Jim O'Donnell	UCONN
Tom Chapman	US FWS
Jim Latimer	US EPA
Dawn McReynolds	NYS DEC
Evelyn Powers	NEIWPCC -IEC
Julie Rose	NOAA
Todd Randall	USACE
Rick Balla	US EPA
Mark Tedesco	US EPA
Nancy Seligson	Town of Mamaroneck - CAC
Curt Johnson	Save the Sound/CFE - CAC
Mel Coté	US EPA
Rob Hust	CT DEEP
Brian Thompson	CT DEEP
Nancy Ferlow	CT NRCS
Tom Morgart	CT NRCS
Ellie Tonkin	US EPA
Joe Siegel	US EPA
Bill Wise	NYSG
Lorraine Holdridge	NYS DEC
Dave Kozak	CT DEEP
Robert Burg	NEIWPCC/US EPA LISO
Peter Francis	CT DEEP
Corinne Fitting	CT DEEP
Cassie Bauer	NYS DEC
Vicky O'Neill	NYS DEC



Long Island Sound Study Management Committee Meeting Sign-in Sheet: October, 2015

Name	Organization
Amy Mandelbaum	NYSG
Judy Preston	LISS/CTSG
Georgia Basso	US FWS/LISS
Charles DeQuillfeldt	NYS DES
Kelly Streich	CT DEEP
Harry Yamalis	CT DEEP
Joe Salata	US EPA
Lynn Dwyer	NFWF
Leah O'Neill	US EPA
Mark Parker	CT DEEP

October Management Committee Meeting Notes

DAY 1:

Thursday, October 22nd, 2015

Welcome/Intro/Announcements, 9:15am - *Mark Tedesco*

- It was decided that the CCMP release/announcement will be through social media. There is a social media outreach plan. Congratulations to all those who worked on the CCMP. Especially, Jim Latimer for leading the effort.
- Today's meeting, we are not going to go through all 100+ Implementation Actions. Instead, we have chosen a limited number of discussion topics within each of the four CCMP themes that we think need to be addressed. We can address other topics if they come up.
- Everyone should have a package for each theme. We will have to move fairly quickly through each topic.
- Day 1 will focus on direction. What work we need to do, how do we accomplish it? Focus on discussion topics.
- Day 2 will be more form and function. Are we organized in the right the way? Do we need to change staff work? Work Groups?
- Breaking news. Passed the recent EPA review.
- Around the room introductions. First, Joe and Ellie are with EPA, facilitators today.
- Housekeeping Rules from the facilitators: Four main topics areas (themes), for each one there are subtopics. At the outset of each main topic (theme) there will a presentation 10-12 minutes with questions afterward. Then, there will opportunity for discussion from the group. Bigger picture items will be deferred for tomorrow. Guidelines for the meeting are to address the challenges. We have 14 discussion topics to go through. We would like people to be succinct and focus on the agenda. There is some overlap between topics but please stay focused. We want to leave here with outcomes to help you move forward. We want consensus as best we can achieve it here. We recognize that we can't cover every single item. We want to capture the census of the group. That is the goal for today and tomorrow. We will push you forward.

2015 CCMP Overview, 9:45am- *Jim Latimer*

- A CCMP is a plan that addresses priority actions. However, the CCMP is really a charter for participation. It is not a strict prescription for activities. It is not a static concept of the future.
- One of the main concepts in the CCMP are these principles: resiliency to climate change, sustainability, environmental justice.
- The 1994 CCMP was very issue based.

- The 2015 CCMP created areas of focus. It is broken up into themes/goals, outcomes, objectives, strategies, and Implementation Actions. There are also Ecosystem Indicators that have specific Ecosystem Targets that drive progress.
- Over the next couple of days we will be focusing on the 2016-2017 High Priority Actions.

Clean Water & Healthy Watersheds, 10:15am

Presentation - Mark Parker

CCMP Actions:

- Improve implementation of nitrogen reductions
- Better track implementation
- Evaluate if reductions would be sufficient to attain water quality standards

Questions:

- How should the LISS assist in technical assessment and tool development to support IAs?
- What are the monitoring and modeling needed to support the next stage of nitrogen management?

Recommendations:

- Apply LISS developed data and tools for eelgrass protection to expand N management to near-shore water quality.
- Expand collaboration on local water scale to ID and implement N reductions to non-regulated sources.
- Build partnership and proposal for next gen modeling partnership.

Discussion

Discussion Topic 1: Nitrogen Management Strategy

Mark T: fundamental questions for us is: Not what allocations will be, but will we have the tools (data, assessments) to do what needs to be done. Improve modeling? Improve understanding of LIS? Should we maintain sole focus on DO in open LIS or shift focus to other impairments that are a result of N overload? Expand tool support? Consider other eutrophication impairments? Eelgrass?

Nancy S: Citizen Perspective – we have spent a lot of money on modeling, but we still can't predict impacts on the system and our understanding has become more complicated over time. Is a model the correct mechanic for actually dealing with this complicated problem? A model doesn't seem all that helpful.

Jim O'D: Opposite perspective: We haven't really spent that much money compared to the cost of the overall program or the investments put into WWTPs, really very little. Modeling is directly relevant because it is the basis for requiring folks to spend a lot on upgrading WWTPs.

It is a central element of the program. The process of modeling in the program was initially ineffective – not open source, couldn't figure out what was there – not accessible. Big problem. Should go forward! Need to quantitatively link actions with response. Need to ensure investments yield results that can be carried on. Operation and maintenance is important. Other scientists couldn't go in and understand and change – inaccessible to scientists, no back and forth, couldn't improve. Need to change that.

Curt J: Step back from model. Interested in other eutrophic impacts in other estuaries – important that we move forward with endpoints. Need actions that can move quickly. We did first TMDL not really on direct output of model. Is there more we can do on cost-effective basis with entire set of WWTPs that discharge to the Sound? Upper states need to act. Made decisions in past on technological capabilities, could do more of this. Very interested in endpoints. Only way to get there with trading is to have the endpoint first, that will facilitate actions.

Julie R: The modeling workshop did discuss alternate endpoints, but didn't establish new ones. What is happening with CT Trading program?

Jim O'D: The question is how do we reduce area of hypoxia?

Jim L: Alternate endpoints, EPA has 4 – chlorophyll,... Can evaluate these in embayments. Need to look at expanding into embayments for management areas. Used to think that models could provide endpoints, but in reality, they are just showing people that less N will result in better water quality, and go from there. Models have other uses.

Jim O'D: Assuming that N is controlling hypoxia – alternative management strategies could also be effective. This is just one approach.

Mark T: NOAA has funding cycles for hypoxia and will have an RFP out soon. Should have a STAC-led RFP on modeling tightly linked to management in both states as an element. Need to get together and be ready for the funding announcement. As part of that, should include idea of other endpoints in addition to hypoxia. We may propose an ensemble approach to modeling. So not just linking N to DO, but also something to link N to other water quality impairments, and include embayments. We already have had focus on eelgrass, and have some tools that we can build on, along with a target in CCMP on eelgrass.

Jim O'D: Need to link action to response. Just can't link N to hypoxia, doesn't mean we need to jump to eelgrass or some other endpoint. There may be a reduction in hypoxia, but we don't have the data to measure it. Does science (modeling theories) provide the rationale for people to pay to make changes?

Rob H: Had 2 day workshop on monitoring and modeling, we need to look at the recommendations that came out of that. In my opinion, we need a better model. We are down to the more difficult, costly measures, need model to support and justify. Trading programs require staffing that we don't have – a resource issue.

Rick B: Load has gone down to WWTP, but septic system and more intensive fertilizer uses have gone up – need to ensure we are accounting for all that. Need to focus on hypoxia, but also embayments, HABS, are important – need to do both.

Susy K: Many of the targets in the TMDL have generally been met, need to ratchet down, and if we don't have a good model, we will get opposition on every single permit

Ellie T: to get to next generation of reductions, need next generation of modeling? Is that where we are?

Curt J: Modeling is important, but we can't wait for the perfect model to take action. Also, can't ask consultants for the endpoint – EPA and people in this room have expertise and should be deciding endpoints.

Mark T: Let's develop a proposal – what would be done, products, utility for next generation of models. Need a workgroup – need to be ready to go in 3 months. Even if we don't get NOAA funding, it would still be helpful and can shop it around to other funding sources.

CW: Concern that embayments can be generalized or not.

Jim L: Proposal – modeling proposal for hypoxia; second proposal for alternate endpoints and embayment

Dawn M: Need to ensure not duplicating effort of other groups, ensure we are checking.

Jim O'D: Can't mix modeling and embayments in the same proposal.

Mark T: Should be left up to group how broad this is. If we clarify how and what, can pursue other avenues of funding.

Ellie T: Have we addressed the recommendations on topic 1?

Rick B: Have addressed #3. Should also pursue 2nd recommendation.

Rob H: A lot of embayment and NPS occurs at state level, and there is already a lot of collaboration going on, so can agree to this.

Leah O'N: If group supports this, it would take us into tomorrow's discussion.

Mark T: That's the way we should look at it – NY state just held hearings on N in Long Island, and we need to support those efforts. What else do we need to do to help support the state efforts? How strong a linkage do we have, do we have the tools to do it? Should be a natural thing that we do.

Ellie T: yes, 2nd recommendation is a priority, will discuss how tomorrow. How about 1st recommendation? Have we already addressed? What do we need to capture?

Rob H: Expand from "eelgrass" to "eelgrass and other alternative endpoints".

General agreement.

Joe S: Near-shore and embayments need to be related to TMDLs that states have for those embayments - ensure it is within state context.

Discussion Topic 2: Embayment Monitoring

Jim O'D: Is this a LISS question, or is it up to the states? What are the bounds of LISS responsibilities?

Rob H: Jim is right. We are working on assessments of the embayments. We need support, but it is certainly the state's responsibility. But having info on endpoints, etc., will help.

Dawn M: Have a workgroup established – need to go back to those recommendations and decide where to go – develop appropriate standards?

Curt J: Uniformity of endpoints is important. The states need to lead this, but workgroup will be desirable to support in terms of endpoints and modeling.

Dawn M: The NPS workgroup might cover.

Jim O'D: the standards would be a good topic for a LISS workgroup, also data management is critical for LISS. But there are hundreds of inlets that states are responsible for.

Jim L: "Assist the states in implementing" is what we need to say.

Joe S: It is the states that set the water quality criteria.

Rob H: There is a whole nutrient criteria piece that we are working on.

Dawn M: CTDEEP is currently piloting something, so that is the beginning of the support.

Evelyn P: There is monitoring for the embayments that IEC did that is not funded for next summer. Recognize and support IEC role.

Mark T: In support of integration – pollutants into embayments and how the embayments exchange nutrients, etc. with the greater LIS is important to understand. Also, we did fund Phase 1 with CT for this year, need to understand what the next step is and how we can obtain additional data. How can local efforts expand this data?

Mark P: The CTDEEP proposal is to put together a volunteer monitoring protocol for embayments

Curt J: If Save the Sound is funded for Report Card, we need to work together, because it also involves a component of developing volunteer monitoring.

Jim O'D: What do we mean by "implement" – deploying instruments, etc? If so, I wouldn't support this. Can we change this to design or de veloping?

Dawn M: Developing protocols is good, but we also need data management aspects that we need to keep in mind and LISS should be involved.

Jim O'D: Need to add and "data management".

Nancy S: Embayments are where the public interact with the Sound, and so LISS really needs to be involved with embayments.

Ellie T: Need to capture a point for tomorrow that the embayments are important for public.

Lynn D: We have funded embayment monitoring before, and these groups are asking for direction, they bring it back to local level, want to know how feeds into overall, and this resonates with embayment groups.

Ellie T: We have a funding question here to discuss tomorrow.

Mark T: We can't just flip a switch and get additional funding, we really are talking about developing what people can collect, how, frequency, how to get funding for expansion in future

Rick B: So, need to add "including a citizen science component"

Discussion Topic 3: Water Quality Monitoring

Recommendations:

Continue open water monitoring and implement inclusion of climate change indicators

Continue investigating avenues for improved efficiency through collaboration and new or improved cost effective sample collection and analysis techniques.

Continue efforts aimed at streamlining data synthesis and reporting.

All agreed. Moving on.

Discussion Topic 4: Eutrophication Modeling support needs

Mark T: We've already said we are going to pull together a group to work out the RFP, so I think we've addressed this.

Jim L: The options and recommendations have already come through a process, do we need to look at the questions in the write-ups instead?

Ellie T: Recommendations are really the endpoint of the discussion on the questions, not sure if we need to go back to the questions.

Jim O'D: The recommendations are very technical. The workgroup is really who needs to make these decisions. We should rely on them to discuss these issues, refine them and develop a way forward in a more process – driven way, to be brought back to the Management Committee.

Joe S: Need clarification – multiple groups or just multiple products?

Mark T: Multiple products of the work group.

Jim O'D: Considering the options and recommendations in the summary, the workgroup should be charged with moving this forward.

Leah O'N: What does the MC want to do with IEC monitoring for embayments?

Mark T: Not making budget decisions today, but would like to make a request to IEC to give MC a proposal for continuation of their embayment monitoring (and their open water monitoring).

Thriving Habitats and Abundant Wildlife, 11:45am

Presentation:

Dave Kozak:

- DSTs are a close cousin to modeling. Intended to ensure that you are making the right decisions that optimize returns on conservation investments.
- Many support tools: SHARP, SIGT, LIS SLAMM, CT River Watershed Landscape conservation Design Pilot
- Lots of models but few staff, little time and not enough data

Vicky O'Neill:

- High reaching goals for restoration and river miles.
- Challenges:
 - o Warming waters
 - o SLR
 - o Increased rainfall and storms

Harry Yamalis:

- Living shorelines
 - o examples
 - o conference and workshops coming up

Discussion:

Discussion Topic 1: Decision making tools

Dave K: Which of these tools should we be helping to usher along in 2016?

Dawn M: First step: what are all the tools and why did we decide to complete those tools?

Address what tools we have and why we need them. What are our priorities for habitat and do we need other tools to meet these priorities?

Brian T: The “needs” question is important too

Lynn D: FWS LCC Tool- priority habitat restoration, fish passage. Very interesting and useful for LISFF making sure what we invest in is the highest priority for our money.

Georgia B: Echo what Lynn said. Need to look at tools that are not being funded through LISS. Regional tools like the LCC tool. The list needs to be put together with a lot of thought.

Ellie: Status of the tools and how it links up to the needs.

Bill W: Goals and additional acreage... where did that come from?

Joe S: Have workgroup come up with what tools are important. Have them make some recommendations forward. Workgroup has the expertise

Dawn M: What are priorities moving forward and do we need tools to do them

Ellie T: Assess what tools are available, purpose and function, where are there gaps?

Jim O’D: Is the necessary data available?

Dave K: A lot of it depends on what the workgroup decides to focus on. List all of the tools and choose the tool that is most ready to drive the issues.

Ellie T: Start with the needs.

Jim O’D: Prioritize which areas will provide a lot of value in the future.

Dawn M: Charge to the workgroup to figure out what tools we have, what tools we need to make the decisions and what those decisions are.

Joe S: Come up with all these tools, but what is available at the time? You want to have a list of priorities but if something is available and not a priority we should look at it. We may have money now and it may not come back.

Discussion Topic 2: Protection and Restoration

Brian T: It has been a successful approach to acquiring properties but is this the best approach (referring to recommendation 2)

Ellie T: Keeping sight of the best overall use of the funds

Jim O'D: Define what the goal of the acquisition programs are. Balance between future marsh expansion and watershed, inlets.

Dawn M: Look at it differently with restoration. Depending on what you are talking about, you are going to look at it differently.

Harry Y: Marsh does not have as much value per acre as upland areas.

Georgia B: Replace opportunistic with strategic.

Jim L: First step is strategic, second is opportunistic.

Mel C: What needs to be updated? We had a framework for doing this.

Dawn M: We have a list for restoration but we don't have priorities.

Harry Y: We can't pick and choose off of the priority list because the properties are privately owned. But, we can encourage them to apply for funding.

Dave K: For tomorrow's discussion- how are you are going to make conservation restoration decisions is going to depend on staff time. Are the workgroups going to focus on sheparding projects vs developing tools?

Mark T: Earlier list was a nomination process, a larger list without a critical evaluation and without considering climate change.

Discussion Topic 3: Living Shoreline use and monitoring

Bill W: Hasn't someone already done recommendation 1?

Jim O'D: We are working on it in CIRCA, we will ultimately have a report that is funded by NOAA. Jen O'D has written a report on living shorelines. Guidelines that engineers can use.

Brian T: How do you assess effectiveness of each type?

Jim O'D: We are funded to do part 1 – what is available and what works and how do you select an area? Second part is design guidelines. Some of this work has been implemented in Chesapeake Bay. Site specific stuff that is necessary.

Ellie T: What is available? What works? What type of monitoring should be done? Site characteristics.

Jim O'D: There is an absence of design guidelines. Engineers like to use design guidelines. If LISS is trying to promote living shorelines we should have design guidelines.

Dawn M: What is LISS role in doing this? Jim is doing a lot of work, the state is doing work, so what is LISS' role? NY is developing guidelines.

Harry Y: We were thinking more conceptual guidelines. Not design guidelines.

Brian T: An excellent role for LISS is communication.

Dawn M: Do we need to work on monitoring? The science behind it. Habitat types, etc. These living shorelines on natural resources

Ellie T:

- LISS role
- Enhance communication
- Look for opportunities to design living shorelines

Dave K: This third topic is different than the other two. This moves right to a technique and is a different level of detail. Do you expect workgroups to take this on? Because staffing is an issue

Jim O'D: This is a priority for CIRCA

Georgia B: Be cautious when we take one priority habitat and focus on it. We will lose some of the habitat workgroup membership if we focus on only some of the habitats.

Curt J: Took a look at the resiliency and habitat response plans and there was virtually no reference to habitats and living shorelines because this was created by town engineers. There is a critical role having to deal with the interaction with habitat and where living shorelines can protect us the most. The point of planning and investigation opportunities for towns has to come from groups like us. This focus is maybe what we are more uniquely set to help towns with.

Ellie T: Where are we? Further refine this group's role

Wrap-up of HW (after lunch)

- Determine and make recommendations of the role of LISS

Sustainable and Resilient Communities Discussion, 2:00pm

Presentation

Nancy S - Discussion Topic 1: Sustainable Communities, Sustainability/Adaptation Planning

- Resiliency – bounce back from weather events
- Sustainability - Conserving resources for future generations
- All about saving money for municipalities. Have municipalities implement GI and LID to help save water, save energy, and reduce carbon footprint. But, how do we get municipalities to address these issues?
- In the Town of Mamaroneck, Nancy provided technical assistance to communities and connected it to quality of life after Hurricane Sandy. They received a grant to study the opportunity of a microgrid for electricity in the community.
- How do we help communities make resiliency and hazard plans for their waterfront? They are required by NY State to do these plans, but how to make them make these plans as a priority.
- Come up with the idea of award program for municipalities; have an online dashboard to view their progress.

Robert B – Discussion Topic 2: Behavior Change and Social Marketing

- Nitrogen reduction must focus on NPS pollution
- See what has been done in Puget Sound NEP and Tampa Bay NEP
- History of what LISS has been doing in regard to behavior change (from 2006-2013)
- Recommendations: develop a behavior change index, create a social science subcommittee in STAC, fund behavior change projects in LISFF or through another grant program like the research grant program (2 year timeline)

Dave K – Discussion Topic 3: Public Access Planning

- LIS is perceived as inaccessible
- Recommendations: create a public access plan (what's limiting, geographic gaps, facilities management, and information gaps)

Nancy S: There are things we can do that can be free or cost-effective. They don't have to be big infrastructure issues.

Discussion Topic 1: Sustainable Communities, Sustainability/Adaptation Planning

Making sustainability a priority.

Curt J: suggested that we should think about the award idea for municipalities or regions. EPA already gives out awards, but have it be more specific to resilient communities in LIS.

Nancy S: have the towns share ideas by hearing what other towns do.

Curt J: blue waters resiliency with EPA.

Jim O'D: combine two agendas by recognize municipalities that do resiliency but also increase public access to LIS.

Joe S: "the soundside community is a soundwise community"; create a program that designates towns as soundwise communities.

Mark P: use climate ready estuary tools

Ellie: idea of recognition

Joe S: Mark T. distributed an email about the Climate Ready estuaries call for funding; we should use those funds.

Ellie T: Where do want to leave this for now?

Bill W: LIS used to have a municipalities and local communities, but it was short-lived. Very few municipal officials attend our meetings, maybe there's a structural issue. Maybe start a dialogue with communities.

Mark T: If you build it, they won't come. Towns are too busy to be involved in a Sound-wide planning process. Towns will have more in common with a neighboring town, rather than throughout the entire Sound.

Ellie T: community oriented help.

Bill W: technical assistance is provided by NY Dept of State.

Nancy S: award idea is attractive and appealing; but every town needs help with providing a resiliency and sustainability plan;

Leah O'N: When CTDEEP had the GI symposium, it was done through CT state and then they helped the communities that way. We should support the states with their programs.

Dawn M: With the Community Risk and Resiliency act, there is a need to create model local laws. See what the states are doing and see what would make sense.

Robert B: Sound-wide award or competition for a regional sound-shore watershed. We would create a model.

Dave K: getting the word out was helpful. If one town hears that it's achievable, it breeds more success and gets more towns involved.

Mel C: Resources were used to help with CART (climate adaptation resiliency toolkit). EPA R1 is working on putting together an online resource in the next couple of months to share information that's going on throughout the region.

Rick B: We haven't talked about Environmental Justice. We need to focus on these areas for public access and social media and behavior change.

Mark T: create a reminder that we need to integrate EJ throughout the CCMP.

Mark T: What's our role and how do we provide value added in state and regional efforts? He likes the idea of thinking about the award, but it's a way of highlighting successful application throughout the region. EPA has done this through its awards. Maybe something that can be with multi-agency. Set up a way to set up self-nominations. Example: Gulf of Maine Marine Environmental Awards is a good model to replicate.

Leah O'N: 1. Find out what the states are already doing with respect to local resiliency planning and local outreach opportunities, and 2. Promote communities through a recognition program or promote model coastal community.

Nancy S: What can we do to make this attractive to communities?

Lynn D: What do we want communities to do? Resiliency planning?

Nancy S: Have communities develop resiliency and sustainability plans.

Discussion Topic 2: Behavior Change and Social Marketing

Curt J: We should do focused social marketing campaigns. Have the behavior change campaigns where we are seeking to localized benefits. Use Jamie Vaudrey's modeling showing the problems of each embayment. Focus the behavior change on an area that would have the biggest benefit. Targeted campaigns. Add targeted campaigns if/when we do behavior change campaigns.

Joe S: What would LISS do? Just develop the index indicators?

Ellie T: We're not in a position to figure out what the targets should be.

Joe S: Who are we talking about? The states are the face of the program to the municipalities. What do you want us to do? What's the action item?

Nancy S: We need to move forward with these kinds of campaigns. Use the research of the LISS communications team to help with this effort.

Mark T: Jersey Friendly Yards campaign is an example of a way to affect change. If we want to embark on this, can we affect the individual homeowner's application of fertilizer? What's the specific behavior we want to change? What are our obstacles? What can we do, should we partner with other entities? There's a lot of thought going into this. There's the MS4 permits or with the trash-free/marine debris program. If we go this route, we need to be very specific of the behavior we want to change, obstacles, and how to address it.

Rob H: If you want to make people do something, you pass a law. They hear a lot from towns regarding their MS4s. We need to think about this from a citizens' point of view.

Susy K: focus funding on social science; consider funding it as an enhancement project.

Joe S: let's have the communications group talk about this some more and come up with behaviors that we want to target, what do we need to do, etc. Have the communications team come up with a proposal.

Mark T: NYC has conducted an extensive survey of public perceptions. They're using it to guide decisions related to stormwater (fertilizer, litter, etc.). We need to step back and assess what surveys have been done, what information is already out there on surveys of public perception and behavior, and then we can decide if we need to do a targeted survey. Then, see what we can do.

Nancy S: this has been done already and was dismissed by regional administrators.

Mark T: not saying that we have to re-evaluate how social marketing can be used to change behavior. But, let's look at other surveys to see what has been done.

Curt J: Judith Enck had a problem with this because there wasn't a significant water quality management outcome. We're getting better with sourcing.

Jim O'D: What will the messaging be?

Mark T: Florida yards initiative's message was to stop mowing your lawn – get people away from a certain type of yard. Do it because it saves you money and time.

Joe S: No child left inside campaign was already done. If we use the AdCouncil, we need to be effective with messaging.

Dawn M: from what we know of our public perception, what will we work on?

Nancy S: we talked about this campaign for a long time. Even if we don't know what the impact would be, we need to do it.

Lynn D: Chesapeake Bay program has a social marketing program – they are changing from a big campaign to more targeted campaigns. What can we draw from it and how to use the tool? Seek lessons learned from Ches. Bay.

Leah O’N: Synthesize data from existing surveys; determine what behaviors we to target; how to track them; and then develop targeted media campaigns.

Discussion Topic 3: Public Access Planning

Dave K: develop a plan to improve public access; a plan might not be needed; instead, do a better job of getting information out on what’s available.

Curt J: If we’re talking about facility improvement, we should consider a combination of recreational use and watermen (oyster farming, etc.) like what they’re doing in NC. If we’re not creating opportunities of how to use the Sound, then what’s the point? Think about the way people access the Sound – it’s usually sitting by the water. Need to think a little more broadly about public access.

Dave K: People like to know that the Sound is there, even if they don’t use it to have an appreciation for it.

Dawn M: Stewardship Days at Stewardship Sites was a great beginning to enhance the management of the sites (on-the-ground projects). Public access is an significant issue on LI. States are responsible for acquiring sites and manages them. How LIS fits in is through the Stewardship Days – maybe expand upon them.

Brian T: this all ties back to the recognition.

Dave K: Flax Pond in Stony Brook, NY doesn’t have parking, so hard to access site. Need signage, map, facilities, and parking.

Rick B: some areas that we want to preserve for ecological reasons, so no parking. But also enhance public areas.

Curt J: Is there an opportunity with the shoreline chambers of commerce and the Stewardship Sites? Get business people involved in Stewardship Areas.

Leah O’N: Harbor walk in Gloucester, MA that engages businesses.

Robert B: need to keep climate change in mind.

Nancy S: think about the larger economic picture of access.

Leah O’N: Enhance communication....

Sound Science and Inclusive Management Topic, 3:30pm

Discussion Topic 4: Data Management

GIS needs assessment (Dawn) haven't we already done?

Jim O'D: can spend a lot of money making it accessible; some people are going to need help accessing the data

Jim L: Need to identify a user group? Worthy goal but should be minimalist if want it to be accessible (and not so expensive)

Brian T: What kind of data are we talking about?

Jim O'D: High school kids – not worth LIS money to be accessible at this level. Ex. Dataset from ConnColl get data in form that needs to be input (paper to digital). Model results should be shared so can use to compare other data to future embayment monitoring program

Robert B: Who is going to do it and where will it be housed?

Jim L: build your own

Jim O'D: Examples of existing databases. Run on Cloud; sustainable (should be built into plan)

Curt: other purpose for data – ability of regular people to use vs research-based information. Another function; critical. For public engagement and education. Town engineers, Etc.

Jim O'D: Databases talking about – more complex, incl. meta-data associated with GIS layers, ex. Making accessible to public – can appreciate, but can be a lot of effort for a few people.

Dave K: 50k that LISS study spent on GIS assessment provided a lot of what we're talking about

Discussion Topic 3: Assessment/reporting

Mark T: right time to be thinking about this: internal reporting management, strategic planning, ecosystem targets, etc. need to rethink how we do these things. Should we continue what we've done in the past?

Leah O'N: A lot of money and time reporting. E-Sound 30K a year. Need to engage people who will be reporting as well as using data.

Rob H: We spend a lot of time reporting; maybe I will volunteer to help with input.

Discussion Topic 2: Creative funding strategies, expanding economic analysis

Rob H: we did the economic analysis; not sure how much we're allowed to publicize.

Curt J: evaluation of all services in watershed of LIS has been done. Not suggesting doing over; evaluate outcomes trying to achieve.

Mark T: study in MD looked at wetland and value of ecosystem services; apply to LIS. Benefits transfer an accepted technique. Recommendation here – shellfish work by CT SG – looking at value of shellfishing in LIS. Example. Go to the primary valuation if possible. Only has value if it has a changing value that you can estimate – SLR or restoration, ex. Reduce N loading and estimate improvement in DO; change in ecosystem with a value (economic standpoint); provide justification/rational for action. Have to provide economic link to action; return on investment. Use as a way to make the case for funding. To quantify the returns.

Curt J: Item 2 critical. ID also direct job creation and economic development as result. Ex water infrastructure improvements in CT important to governor because of job creation.

Jim O'D: Do we need evaluation of marsh values in LIS? If someone were to give up house to create marsh – valuation needed.

Mark T: There are established valuations used; what are you valuing? Some change; not just value of existing. Then value can be compared to cost.

Curt J: Innovation valuation: add to regulatory drivers ... “and the relationship to valuation drivers.”

Jim L. Area times the value – primary valuation. Joe: even altobello report, we had no area specific values for some of the values she needed. Borrowed from Florida.

Jim O'D: Still in favor of est. values of a few marshes in CT.

Leah O'N: Not questioning value of doing it; EPA not likely to fund; that's what we're looking at today.

Nancy: Always thought it would be valuable to have those valuations. Powerful argument found in that information/numbers. Help to lobby for money. LIS has a perception problem, esp in Washington.

Rob H: Wasn't anything valuable from Altobello report? Mark: wasn't very expensive; yes there is useful information in it. Has limitations.

Jim L: Primary valuations should include? We shouldn't have to rely on values that are not generated from LIS area.

Dave K: Altobello, Earth Economics reports –

Robert B: meet outside for picture by gazebo for social media...

Curt J: EE Report replicated some aspects of the Altobello report. Increased recreational value, probably due to all the people who get out on the water now in plastic kayaks... and cleaner water.

Discussion Topic 1: Science needs to support management for the next 5 years

Suggesting advisory group for research.

Jim L: small group, incl. new science coordinator. And science inventory.

Mark T: science inventory online? Yes.

Jim L: research priorities now seem to be ad hoc; need to be more systematic.

Curt J: amend – additional step that this group will come up with ideas to STAC for focused discussion.

Mark T: Our task not to put together all science needs. Need to identify the management needs that need science to guide.

Julie R: We already know what has been funded. What's there that is targeting specific questions we're interested in?

Nancy S: we need to look at new way of accomplishing the tasks that we're talking about; this is business as usual (creating workgroups to take a look at...). Different structure. May need to adjust the workgroups.

Curt J: take an honest look at how things have changed in 20 years (skills, funding, etc.). Where will resources come from? Other allies needed. Creating workgroups can keep us from engaging other critical partners. Need to tap into other partners.

Jim L: Management team where we engage partners. Workgroups are still important; where work on ground happens.

Wrap-up and Summary of Day 1:

Consider whether your organization can get this done.

Think about how CCMP is structured and how we need to move forward from now on. Think bigger picture.

Have big picture discussion tomorrow first.

Do we have the right people on the MC? Do we have the right workgroups?

DAY 2: Friday, October 23, 2015

Announcements/Recap, 8:00am

Ellie T: gave overview of Day 2 agenda and the order of the discussions, starting with the big picture discussion followed by the theme discussions. The discussion of technical work groups will be at 1:15pm. At 1:45pm, there will be a social media discussion. At 2:00pm, there will be a wrap up.

Questions from yesterday – no one responded.

Mark T: Welcome Larry Swanson; News 12 had a big report on the plan for LIS

Big Picture Discussion, 8:15am

Leah O’N: Focus on just how these committees and workgroups are interacting with each other, not what new workgroups or changes to workgroups we should make. That will be a later discussion.

Ellie T: Suggestion to organize the discussion by starting at the top of the slide (with the policy committee all the way down to the workgroup). Take a moment to jot things down and get into this topic

Lorraine H: Executive steering committee was created for a reason. When significant policy decisions need to be made, the actual reality of the policy committee getting together is unrealistic so the executive steering committee was created as a place holder. No commitment of meeting on any type of schedule.

Ellie T: Did it ever serve a purpose it was created for?

Joe S: So questions come to the top but not solved at this type of table, more at the regulatory regime. We don’t want to bother them with routine meetings so much, that takes place is at the MC level. Policy Committee met in 2003 for agreement but not used that often. Dredging issue is solved in that area, not by LISS policy committee.

Ellie T: Role might be limited but is it a needed role?

Nancy S: Hoping the new CCMP would enhance and encourage communication between policy committee and CAC

Joe S: CAC can meet with policy committee

Jim L: Nice to have these groups to be called upon as needed. They should stay and be used as a resource

Brian T: Can't dissolve it unilaterally

Ellie T: Role of the policy and executive steering committee is limited but is needed

Mark T: Executive steering committee has not met in over a year. Assumption would be to continue and try to schedule a next meeting before we make any of the budget decisions in April. We should report out on any recommendations from this group

Charlie D: Agrees we should continue executive steering committee. Serves a purpose because we generally can't get commissioner to go to anything.

Ellie T: Is there a more active way to get them engaged?

Nancy S: Helpful to have them meet before we make budget decisions

Rob H: Meeting before budget decisions and then only as big issues arise

Susy K: Just because there hasn't been a formal meeting doesn't mean that they haven't been involved. For example, they have been on several TMDL calls.

Joe S: MC members go back and inform higher level reps in their organization

Larry S: I-team seems to have all the power...where does that fit into the structure?

Joe S: I-team consists of representatives from the MC

Mark T: Is there a comment on the function of the I-team meeting?

Larry S: We have heard "the I-team has decided" and MC just takes it

Joe S: I-team meets a month before the MC to develop the agenda and many MC members are included in that discussion

Mark T: How did we decide the agenda, the background materials for this meeting...It was the I-team meeting members that volunteered. Anyone can attend, the I-team is not a secret society.

We welcome anyone to participate. Open for discussion how to make it work for the MC and help support the actions.

Nancy S: Perfect example of where we can improve the MC. Somehow the communication does not flow. Some people here are focused entirely on LISS and some are not. So the people who do not do LISS on a day to day basis feel out of it. We need to be more connected.

Joe S: The issue might be Nancy does not have someone that goes back to her and reports on the meeting like Mark P does for Corinne and Cassie does for Dawn

Ellie T: Intention of the I-team is to be inclusionary and get as much help as they can?

Mark T: Nancy/Larry--What can we do to increase communication without overburdening people?

Curt J: I-team is reflecting the capacity that is lower, we should talk about the bigger picture for now.

- What is different now from 1994?
 - o NGO perspective- capacity has shifted a little bit.
 - o 20 years ago the work from Vaudrey might have been brought to use from agencies.
 - o We are seeing innovation from different avenues now because of the limited capacity of the agency
 - o Partnership- concerned about marshes, dredging, and beneficial reuse- beginning of a partnership discussion. That discussion happened offline- at dinner. Important initiative
 - o NRCS has capacity in dollars that are probably greater than what exists in LISS, we only have 3.5 million
 - o What can NGO, Core, NRS, bring to the table?
 - o Asking what the word partner means- this will not come up in the I-team
 - o CIRCA is from an academic perspective

Jim O'D: CIRCA focuses mainly on one state. Functioning of the STAC- I find it productive because I engage in it but many of my colleagues don't think it is that effective. What can we do to get people to show up and participate? More money would help. STAC members have other responsibilities so more money would engage them.

- How to make the STAC more effective?
 - o Needs to be continuing staff support for STAC to get things going.
 - o Other opinions?

Rob H: Science coordinator- their role is missing from the chart. How does it relate to the STAC?

Mark T: Bill, Jim and Larry reviewed the write up to the Science Coordinator position. Intent for science coordinator to do the role that Jim talked about- staff support for the STAC.

Jim O'D: Other workgroups have LISS staff that lead it but the STAC does not. Hard to count on STAC members when they have other responsibilities. If you ask STAC to write a proposal for LISS, it is taking away time to write proposals on behalf of their institutions

Rick B: Hiring a science coordinator was not an easy process but we envision that it will help the STAC

Julie R: STAC most effective when specific questions are asked of it. For example, they were asked to review the report card. We should be more specific about what the expectations are. Alternative endpoints- have science coordinator head that up but have STAC members participate

Ellie T: Writing a proposal is tough to ask but asking them a specific question is something STAC can do

Mark T: Caution against thinking STAC is the scientific therapist. It has been effective when we have a clear charge for their activities. When we know what we want input from them and have clear specific topic to give them for advice. Articulate clear questions that we can ask STAC. We have to be clear of what we are asking the STAC. Provide support to keep follow up going

Robert B: Did anyone follow up and thank the STAC in being active in the report card? People want to feel wanted and appreciated.

Joe S: Jim/Larry- do your institutions recognize that you are the co-chairs of this group?

Jim O'D: Only two things you get awarded for, teaching classes and getting grants

Joe S: Is there anything institutional or budget wise we can do to help?

Jim O'D: Reason I started to come to meetings because of the interesting topics that go on. I encourage faculty to come. If you only go to one meeting, you don't see much but if you go several times you see outcomes and meet other people.

Larry S: Second what Jim has said. Stony brook faculty has said "why should I waste my time?" The book was born from the STAC. The scientific basis that formed the CCMP. Authors are actively engaged in the STAC. Don't want to forget that. We had a very specific goal and a deadline and we gradually got it done.

Jim O'D: Only reason the book finished is because Jim L drove it

Larry S: We need staff support but we also need to look at the budget again. Can't keep lowering the research budget.

Joe S: Think about any Institutional support that can help the situation. We did have STAC interns before. Maybe co-chairs should get a STAC intern? Give you an appointment letter?

Larry S: On the NY side you have to keep in mind there are a lot of competing programs...PEP, NY harbor- our people are migrating to where they see the bucks. SSER is taking some of our people.

Lorraine H: Scientific questions or topics may not be of interest to the STAC members. Interest wasn't there? Why? Other than the money.

Larry S: At one point there were some of the 4 most sediment people working on the LIS. That was pushed aside now- those who were doing a lot of that drifted away. Dredging sediment dynamic issues were done already but we decided that issue was not important until last STAC issue. We lose people because of what their specialty is and what the LISS is doing

Lorraine H: Should what LISS is focused on be informed at all by STAC? Is there forward thinking stuff?

Larry S: We did not mention ocean acidification that much in the CCMP. It is very important in the academic world. We should look to see if we have enough emphasis on that in the LISS. We are being driven about what we did in the past and where we should be going.

Leah O'N: Ebbs and flows of participation in the CAC and STAC. CAC submits a letter to LISS advising priorities. Should STAC also submit a letter? STAC has made small research requests, but what about other workshops to help STAC get energized?

Ellie T: Last thoughts about big picture

Mark T: The first challenge that we listed in CCMP was acidification. We talked yesterday about other impairments. We got consensus to include other impairments to eutrophication and acidification is included in that.

Jim L: We need to know more about these so it is a research question

Jim O'D: Summary

- Identifying specific tasks for STAC makes people effective
- Support for Coordinator position that would ask them to organize and collate reports from STAC meetings
- Appointing Jim L to continue to write things

Larry S: One of the interns that got us interested in spatial planning.

Joe S: Interns had to have a specific project.

Brian T: Lorraine made a great point that this should be a two-way conversation between STAC and MC. One way to improve that is to have more presentations of material to MC. Chris Elphick made a presentation on what he was doing. Research is out there but to see it live makes a big difference.

Nancy S: Helpful to have a conversation about the STAC and structure but get back to what Curt mentioned about really big picture. Include other top level people in a bigger way and a more structured way. Kind of what we are asking of the STAC.

Ellie T: Recap

- I team- how to enhance transparency
- How to reflect and truly realize the potential beyond EPA funding
- STAC engagement

Clean Waters and Healthy Watersheds- form and function, 9:15am

Leah O'N: Current state of the workgroups on the slide. How will we move forward and implement them. Next two slides encompass recommendations from day one and tabs are next steps and how we would implement it or a stab of it. Needs for 2016

Rob H: First recommendation on the slide is a state program

Mark T: Our focus to date has been on open water hypoxia, we want to evaluate other eutrophication impairments often embayment/smaller scale. To support that would be through modeling etc.

Dawn M: Understanding what is going on with CTDEEP proposal and getting NY involved so we know a little more about what is going on so a group that thinks of all of that would be helpful. Need to interact a little more.

Curt J: - Two things missing from slide:

1. Role of citizen work to do some of that coordination
 2. We talked about endpoints that drive changed (Leah's response- this recommendation is on slide 2)
- Not seeing this moving the bus forward. We have to do more and do it more quickly. It is a symptom of the problem that I eluded to early of what the I-team can do. Get the STAC involved in endpoints.

Rick B: We need to do more with respect to NPS. Mention citizen involvement in first bullet.

Jim O'D: We don't want a sampling program to be started....we need data first

Leah O'N: Embayment monitoring- we did bring people together to think about proposal 2. Do we want the ad hoc embayment group?

Dawn M: We need a permanent embayment group with LISS staff

Jim O'D: Next step is to design a more sustainable system and figure out if hypoxic is more or less as a result of management

Rob H: We have to protect and designate uses as a state. Maybe that should be on there. Nutrients, bacteria. We welcome support from the study to help us do that but we have those responsibilities that go well beyond the study.

Mark T: We can apply that to open sound water too... state waters and designated uses etc. We still think there is a need to look at impairments nearshore and figure out how to do that.

Rob H: LIS is a lot different from other estuaries. We have 100s of little embayments

Jim O'D: Hempstead harbor and Oyster Bay are highly impacted by the Sound proper but hundreds of others that are not impacted at all with LIS proper

Larry S: Embayments go far beyond just monitoring. I can tell you SB harbor is in good shape because there is a plug that don't let hypoxic water in but flax pond is bad because of being closed up. This is a research question.

Leah O'N: Challenge is in order to have funding in 2017 we have to have a proposal for the next MC meeting or so. Maybe an embayment workgroup is necessary

Rick B: Part of our efforts is to communicate with citizens

Leah O'N: Ability of embayments to respond to the factors coming in. Not embayments fault.

- Summary
 - o Organizing an embayment workgroup
 - o CTDEEP whether they would be ready to continue or expand embayment work.

Curt J: Our organization is gearing up to doing more this summer. Studying hydrology...

Leah O'N: CTDEEPs work is to develop a protocol for citizen monitoring

Recommendation 3 – open water monitoring

Susy K: Talk about IEC monitoring becoming part of the base support like CTDEEP is. QUESTION FOR LATER.

Rick B: Emphasize hypoxia in recommendation 3

Jim O'D: From WQ workshop- improve design. No real resolution of how to do that.

Leah O'N: This is the next recommendation. Do we need WQ workgroup and a sentinel monitoring WQ? How would we implement these actions? Data analysis- falls into same category Next slide goes to address and refine eutrophication modeling recommendations, having STAC develop proposal, role of science coordinator.

Curt J: Agree on second point on this slide. Do we have to wait for a whole process? Sweet spot for EPA, what EPA and States have used for endpoints, not for an outside consultant.

Lorraine H: NYS is looking to actively pursue on the LI wide basis is looking at the concept of what are alternative endpoints for eutrophication. Thinking about what is going on in rest of LI. It is disconnected. The LISS, endpoints that would be appropriate on north shore of LI would also be appropriate in CT MA and Peconics. Thinking about this endpoint concept, expand the universe of what is going on outside the LISS. Comes down to partners.

Dawn M: Make sure things are not duplicated

Julie R: Having an alternative endpoints and outside contractor, clear leader would be new science coordinator. First box are endpoints and tools to expand management

Mark T: Idea of doing point one should not be in isolation. October meeting with EPA to talk about many of these things. Make sure we have this interaction. Second part is the tools. Think about how we can improve nitrogen inputs to the endpoints. Relate to nitrogen loadings. Proposal is related to the second part not the first part.

Jim O'D: Can the new science coordinator do all this work?

Susy K: Mark and I interviewed people last week for this position. Five had PhDs and are qualified to do this work. No one can do all work.

Thriving Habitats and Abundant Wildlife- form and function, 10:15am

Curt J: Funding opportunities for restoration could include marsh projects with the USACE. Haven't done this in this estuary. Need to pull in partnerships.

Charlie D: cautions against identifying individual sites for protection. That affects the price.

Dawn M: Better identify sites for restoration and protection using tools that look at connectivity, quality, and quantity. In that prioritization scheme, what do we use? We need to develop a way to develop those priorities.

Georgia B: We are looking at a landscape scale. Take the ecosystem approach to get an output of sites. It feeds into a goal. A holistic approach.

Dawn M: Developing a way to assess the most valuable properties and habitat.

Dave K: Disagreeing that we identify sites for priorities. First, need to identify ecological value of sites and then look at the sites that meet those conservation restoration goals. Might be to look for areas for tidal marsh expansion. Or, it may be to protect species that use coastal forests for migration stations. Once you ID those goals then you look at the parcel level to find the size, prices, etc.

Ellie T: Need to focus on the goals we want to accomplish, then make a list.

Nancy S: We did talk about having some flexibility in the process. If the site is available, take the opportunity.

Mark T: While the CCMP does list some priority sites, at the end of the CCMP, the emphasis really is in the strategy. The tools used to identify these priorities.

Harry Y: Once we go through the process and create the list. First evaluate and then create the list.

Jim L: We are lumping a lot of actions that deal with this idea. We are trying to capture that here.

Curt J: I think what I was hearing from Dave yesterday is a call from prioritization of time and resources. Recognize that we have a very capable team but limited resources.

Dave K: We always have that issue with distribute tasks.

Curt J: Worth the conversation. Maybe to discuss with TNC and Audubon, in the this world we are looking, are there institutional priorities, that you can focus on/

Dave K: Getting the data to find those tools and run those tools. Only if we show those organizations the money.

Georgia B: TNC and Audubon are delivering on goals that might not be there goals. Maybe talk with organizations and see what their goals are for the year.

Brian T: We have paid staff on the HRWG but not on the SWG. Dave has a lot of responsibilities. Should we think about combining the groups?

Georgia B: A lot for us to run both groups, 8 meetings a year.

Dawn M: Acquisition, 12 habitat types, restoration, a lot to talk about. Got to be a mechanism to create a list of items that can incorporate SLR, benefits, etc. A lot to look at.

Curt J: Regulatory models for protecting lands are really important to create these lists. Guidance is important. In CT, the second biggest landowner is power companies.

Ellie T: developing the priorities and approach, might become aware of opportunities.

Jim O'D: Public access should be used in the determination for priority acquisitions. It would amplify public value.

Leah O'N: What action should the workgroups focus on? Tools? Acquisition/restoration priorities? Living shorelines?

Brian T: The first two go together. Have to happen together. What are the goals, creating a list, using those tools?

Dawn M: Some work that the HRWG has started already. Moved to other states. Georgia started mapping current habitat value. Needs to move to NY. Task the HRWG to defining those things are and move it forward.

Ellie T: So, the first two priorities should have the greatest emphasis. Is there more to say on the third one?

Jim O'D: LISS is supportive but doesn't need to be too active.

Leah O'N: Should the groups be updated from CIRCA, TNC, etc?

Jim O'D: Yes, they should update the workgroups on this work.

Curt J: How can we help? Coordination with the groups?

Jim O'D: Yes, this would be helpful.

Sustainable and Resilient Communities- form and function, 11:00am

Ellie T went over the recommendations from Day 1.

Recommendations 1 & 2 (recognition program and helping communities with the development of sustainability & resiliency plans):

Nancy S: She thought that what was listed was only one part, but she thinks that there is a role for LISS to help or encourage municipalities.

Curt J: to provide training or tools for municipalities.

Brian T: we first need to find out what the outreach opportunities are and then figure out what kind of technical assistance is needed.

Dave K: how do you define local resiliency planning? Is it helping communities respond to an increase of flooding or marshes' response to sea level rise. Also, the infrastructure flooding as a result of sea level rise. This information will be coming out through the SLAMM. Do you think Dave and Vicky should go out and distribute the SLAMM results (that would help communities develop plans)? Is it expected to develop programs to help communities?

Mark T: We're blurring the discussion regarding the habitat/resiliency question and the sustainability question. We need to focus on Nancy's context of sustainability. However, resiliency does go back to the habitat work and SLAMM tools. There are implications for resiliency. We need to focus on local sustainability planning, not so much on resiliency and flooding impact.

Jim L: resiliency has 2 components.

Jim O'D: sustainability could be encouraging the reduction of energy uses. He thinks that the stress that will occur on LIS will depend on C emissions. Sustainability and resiliency are linked. The role of LISS is to inform people about the link between the two and to encourage sustainability. Let people know that the cost of CO2 emission reductions will help protect your houses and infrastructure along the shoreline.

Jim L: LISS needs to go out to the communities and help them develop these plans.

Brian T: LISS doesn't have the resources to go out to the communities to do this.

Jim O'D: CIRCA is trying to help towns and provide them resources.

Nancy S: What is the role of the LISS to make sure each community has a sustainability and resiliency plan?

Curt J: What's doable is the recognition of other communities. Help others be aware of the cycle. Maybe LISS works with CIRCA to develop tools for municipalities. Partner with CIRCA to identify communications for towns tools and resources.

Dawn M: NY State is doing work on sea level rise. And NY State is doing coastal resiliency and working on resiliency plans.

Curt J: Maybe combine CIRCA and NYS materials and circulate them around to municipalities.

Jim L: These are all listed as actions in the CCMP.

Ellie T: sounds like there is a need for coordination.

Brian T: to get these things done, it comes down to money. HUD has funds for this. NRDC and CT National Disaster Competition.

Nancy S: She got money to do hazard mitigation projects regarding extreme weather events and flooding. Most municipalities have a hazard mitigation plan to get this going.

Jim L: sounds like a new work group.

Jim O'D: how about a meeting instead? There's a lot going on. CIRCA is really busy regarding their programs.

Brian T: Coordination is needed. NYSDOS is doing work, but they're not here.

Curt J: Is there an effective meeting or value in providing tools or coordination function to offer tools for each town.

Jim O'D: A lot of funding is focused on Sandy-impacted areas, which aren't in LIS. So, that's why there's a lack of connection to this in NY. We should gather information and then figure out next year what the plan should be for LISS.

Dawn M: How about we release the model coastal community concept? This would help us give a sense of what was needed to develop their resiliency and sustainability plans? This would be part of the recognition idea.

Brian T: we could definitely work on that.

Larry S: Research questions. There's been a lot of talk on preserving marshes, but we haven't talked about the re-distribution of sediments: don't know whether we're going to grow or go under water. What's happening to Orient or Greenport? Maybe Orient will become an island? It would be nice to know the sediment distribution with respect to climate change.

Brian T: There's the notion of importing sediment into the system.

Nancy S: Don't want to lose the notion of the recognition of the exemplary communities in NY and CT. Maybe this could be part of a Communications Team effort. This could be a model for other communities.

Mark T: the only way that we would be able to identify a recognition program, we would first need to develop guidelines for recognition. We need the perspective of both states in regard to how they interface with municipalities. A work group might not make sense. Is there a meeting or conference that would bring people together? This would be an exchange of ideas and then talking about creating a recognition program for communities.

Ellie T: there are different kinds of recognition other than awards.

Curt J: CIRCA will be the clear partner on the CT side. Who would we talk to on the NY side?

Dawn M: Either DOS or climate change office in Albany.

Bill W: Look at Tuoro Law Center in regard to model resiliency ordinances. They have good relationships with DOS and climate change. He would put us in touch with the Director of the Tuoro Law Center.

Judy P: her coastal community put together a plan in regard to sea level rise. People either didn't care or decided to sell their house. The window of opportunity to get the message out regarding this is closing. People don't want to do a soft/living shoreline as it won't help them right away.

Jim O'D: He's heard it too. People think that adaptation and hazard mitigation are unlinked, but they are very much felt at the coastal community scale. If we don't reduce CO2 emissions, we will have 4 meters of sea level rise.

Judy P: Any program or opportunity to talk with communities would be to promote living shorelines.

Joe Salata: It's up the States to the communicator of the information. We could possibly fund a conference or another meeting to do this kind of work. Maybe this is discussed at the I-Team level.

Curt J: There needs to be a recognition process and a way to share tools to towns. Would CIRCA be willing to reach out to NY counterpart to meet and discuss joint programs (sharing of recognition program and tools/resources)? And Nancy would like to be part of the conversation. If there's a budget proposal, send it to Mark T. by January 2016.

Jim O'D: Thought that this was so large at first. But now thinks that a meeting to share what's been done and a way ahead to discuss policy and recognition program makes sense.

Curt J: also discuss a sharing of tools and funding sources.

Bill W: help find funding for 'recognition trailway.'

Recommendation 3 (behavior change):

Susy K: weren't we supposed to create a new survey?

Curt J: trying to come up with a social media campaign

Robert B: We don't know if there's additional information on whether we need to conduct another survey (to track behavior change over time) or to create another social marketing campaign?

Jim O'D: Do we need to know if message types are effective

Lorraine H: NYC put together a social media campaign and researched what works; these questions were already answered by a number of people. We can just use their data.

Robert B: He disagrees. We still don't know what changes people's behaviors.

Curt J: we first need to research and then need to implement.

Rick B: maybe we should do a nitrogen/fertilizer tax credit.

Robert B: we need to come up with ways to change people's behaviors. We would need to create a work group for social science.

Bill W: NY/CT/NJ Sea Grants are wrapping up social science research program on Hurricane Sandy. This put us in touch with a lot of people that we typically don't work with. We could help with this kind of work with our new connections.

Recommendation 4 (public access):

Dawn M: The Habitat Restoration WG/Stewardship WG/Communications WG already did work on Stewardship Days. Is there a way we can expand on this to get stewardship site managers more involved? What are the next steps?

Robert B: The Stewardship Days focused on the 33 Stewardship Areas, which is different than Dave's 262 sites. This would be a different program.

Dave K: We could have a CT coastal access guide if we work with GIS people at CTDEEP, and those positions don't exist anymore.

Dawn M: We've always focused on Stewardship Areas? Are we done with that work? Should we expand that work? It would be good to have Heather in NYS work with Dave Kozak (Heather is Dave's counterpart).

Mark T: Let's identify what it would entail to expand upon these projects and figure out how to advance this topic.

Curt J: Does NRCS have any resources to look at the question regarding agriculture?

Tom M: This would line up with rural development program.

Dawn M: Have we ever highlighted sites that we bought with LISS funds? The work group should think about how to expand the world of LISS involvement.

Joe S: Habitat restoration is reported annually through the NEPORT reporting system. So, we know the acreage restored and all the details associated with it. We also know what we acquired with LIS funds.

Dawn M: We need to add those dots to the map.

Rick B: Let's talk about Environmental Justice when it comes to acquiring more properties and the suggestion for the next phase.

Dawn M: NYC does a lot with EJ areas.

Rick B: We need to continue work in Hunts Point, Bronx area.

Mark T: When we think about the LISFF, we want it to reflect these ideas for emphasis and use that as a funding source to accomplish these ideas.

Science and Management discussion- form and function, 12:30pm

Jim O'D: Proposed a subcommittee

Jim O'D: solicit ideas from STAC re research needs; submit to advisory board; create RFP from this list. An inventory of what has been done; some in new CCMP, but not all that's needed

Jim L: Emphasis on management research needs; small group including STAC and mgmt. committee; run through STAC

Rob H: Biennial research conference – opportunity to get people together for this; also new science coordinator position

Jim O'D: Not all STAC ideas will be appropriate for LISS. Start process of STAC solicitation.

Jim O'D: Should not have new hire create list w/o STAC; would continue to diminish role of STAC

Julie R: There hasn't been communication between workgroups and STAC; good to have new hire play this role

Larry S: In NY every effort to reduce N has been used by politicians to justify population gain.

Jim L: concept of ecosystem services a new template; evaluating tradeoffs; being used at national level.

Can we assess ecosystem value at a useful scale?

Jim O'D: yes. But so site specific; how useful? Need benefit cost ratio. Process is imprecise.

Brian T: Can look at benefit return even from opportunistic marsh restoration

Scale is an important consideration re value of restoration

Susy K: one of the challenges - we don't have people with this expertise

Larry S: The STAC can handle this issue; should discuss (matching evaluation of ecosystem services/restoration)

Mark T: If we move forward with this, should be part of research agenda

Technical Workgroup Discussion, 1:15pm

Leah put up a slide with current workgroups on the left and suggested workgroups for discussion on the right.

Data Management would go into monitoring workgroup

Jim O'D: We need to have experts engaged in WQ monitoring and modeling. We can't avoid having a model but need some consensus

Mark T: Not holding Nov 20th STAC meeting but instead have a group to participate in a proposal development. Discussion on how to advance this idea. NOAA will have a competition and evaluate who they will fund. Evaluation criteria is how the proposal has implication for management and how they might use them. If we can get endorsement from LISS and LISS folks on the proposal it would verify how it would relate to management.

Susy K: Group that looks at the modeling should consult with the state folks who are on the TMDL workgroup. We need to make sure the model is going to work for the states

Jim L: We are including the model to not just be open water.

Leah O'N:

- Reporting moved to an ad hoc workgroup
- Ad hoc modeling workgroup

Dawn M: We will need modelers for a couple of the workgroups. Ad hoc workgroup right now but it will be needed to inform other workgroups

Jim O'D: Happy to organize a November 20th meeting. We should orient a proposal for CHRP that focuses on hypoxia but should also focus on endpoints that are not a part of this NOAA RFP agenda but important to LISS agenda. We have to focus on what NOAA wants. We have to focus on the big picture. The meeting can look at big picture from LISS perspective.

Robert B: Nothing about sustainable and resiliency in workgroups. Does this fit into watersheds workgroup?

Kelly S: Watersheds and sustainability, not watersheds and embayments

Rob H: NPS was mostly management

Jim L: relationship between watersheds and management.

Rob H: some embayments are strictly point source

Leah O'N: came from expertise of staff. With staff available and resources who would lead sustainability workgroup

Mark T: Emphasis on helping to support communication of other efforts not necessarily having a defined workgroup for sustainability.

Nancy S: could be within communications workgroup

Ellie T: Resiliency and sustainability is a cross cutting issue and not a standalone workgroup

Julie R: mixed feelings about combining WQ and Sentinel monitoring WG. Seems like they have different chargers. One option could be to accept climate change as a cross cutting issue.

- Choices: have a climate change workgroup that looks at SLR, acidification, etc. Sentinel monitoring was very focused on looking at certain species. Concerned about staffing for sentinel monitoring.

Dawn M: We have been talking about climate change as cross-cutting but not as one thing and not as one priority. So, I am proposing we should have a standing climate change workgroup.

Ellie T: thinking that it is a resource to all the other workgroups

Bill W: crosscutting so should charge it to all of the workgroups to look at it in their area

Julie R: that is an option but you are making the choice not to revisit the sentinel monitoring program like it was originally intended.

Brian T: so we could do that as an ad hoc workgroup

Julie R: We funded pilot scale monitoring projects that were land and water based. Sentinel monitoring will get lost if combined with water quality workgroup

Robert B: Evaluate whether the pilot scale should be rolled out into a program

Dawn M: needs to be that ad hoc workgroup because we spent a lot of money on sentinel monitoring.

Julie R: project Wally for salt marshes, Chris Elphick birds, looking at chemical factors. Two are still ongoing.

Mark T: inventory is also being made

Bill W: concern if you make a specific workgroup you are not handling it as a climate change issue

Ellie T: with an ad hoc workgroup still need to figure out staffing.

Jim L: regarding monitoring we need to broaden our perspective. Wq monitoring in open water and embayments and sentinels. Sentinel is an ad hoc and then becomes part of the wq monitoring

Embayment monitoring would be part of monitoring

Ellie T: ad hoc sentinel monitoring, standing monitoring & embayment workgroup

Corinne F: initially embayments should be with monitoring and then move to watersheds TMDL workgroup or watersheds to do NPS?

Mark P: NPS has not met in couple of years. What would be asking them to do? Most of the charge has been through the 5 state TMDL. Have mark and cassie focus on the sentinel monitoring workgroup

Charlie D: The major players involved in NPS were focused on the CCMP. So may still be needed.

Robert B: communications can work with mark and cassie on sustainability and resiliency for sentinel monitoring

Leah O’N: all of the work would then fall on the monitoring in the near term

Larry S: Where do we go with the sentinel monitoring – is it like the mussel watch program? We heard some interesting discussions at the STAC

Dawn M: we need an ad hoc meeting

Jim O’D: go back to if these are the appropriate needs

Rick B: should be a group focused on NPS

Judy P: not losing NPS, maybe include it in another one but we can’t lose it.

Leah O’N: Leads will get an email from Leah to write 1-pagers for January meeting and write necessary proposals

Workgroups:

Five state TMDL

Habitat restoration and stewardship

Watershed and Embayment
Water Quality Monitoring
Communications

Ad hoc Workgroups:

Reporting
Modeling
Sentinel

Final comments:

Larry: I see this as a CT centered program and this bothers me. NY operates totally different than CT but NY ought to try to get the fair share of the pie.

Jim O'D: The STAC representatives in NY have fluctuated. It is important to make sure people know there is an impact so they show up at meetings. Need more engagement. We are not creating an environment that we get people to show up

Mark T: 2015 LISFF had 13 projects in NY and 9 in CT. So, NY got a greater number of projects this time.

Bill W: clear geopolitical balance that we want to meet.

CCMP release and social media overview

Leah O'N: hosted two social media webinars

- Infographic was developed, links to different sections as we go through.
- 5 week plan- posts for different themes during whole week
- Public summary was handed out. Contact Amy Mandelbaum.
- Only have 500 copies of the actual CCMP- can access it online, along with the IAs

Dawn M: are we still signing the document?

Leah O'N: maybe ceremony in the spring?

Nancy S: would like some type of signing event

Mel C: way to measure re-tweets and how to figure out how many followers and how many people this gets to?

Leah O'N: letter from Program evaluation said to amp up our social media.

Feedback

Two day meeting- was it useful?

Susy K: having a facilitator was very useful

Mel C: having a two day is great to have some down time and side bar opportunities

Nancy S: preparation that went into the meeting and crafting the agenda was key. Need better food and room with windows.

Rick B: good to have all agencies represented

Bill W: we did kick some issues down the road but that is often the way things end up