

SUMMARY OF PHASE 2 STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

November 2017

This document was created by RK&K with input from Partnership for the Delaware Estuary (PDE) to summarize input gathered via a series of engagement opportunities created to solicit feedback on the Core Elements of a Revised Comprehensive Conservation Management Plan (CCMP) for the Delaware Estuary. It includes input received at eight open houses, 12 presentations to stakeholder groups, and comments submitted online. The open houses and stakeholder presentations were held between late August 2017 and mid October 2017, and the online comments were submitted throughout this period. This summary includes an overview of the process and synthesis of the comments offered by participants at each open house and stakeholder presentation, with an appendix containing more specific and detailed comments.

CONTENTS

Introduction	2
Phase 1: Expert stakeholder INput	2
Phase 2: Local/partner Stakeholder input	2
Open Houses	3
Open House Communications	3
Open House Agenda	4
Summary of All Open House Comments	4
Summary of Each Open House	7
Stakeholder Presentations.....	10
Online Comments	11
Next Steps	12

Appendices (to be made available on SharePoint)

- Appendix A: Core Elements provided at the Open Houses and Stakeholder Presentations
- Appendix B: Database of all comments received

INTRODUCTION

The Partnership for the Delaware Estuary (PDE), on behalf of the Delaware Estuary Program (DELEP), has invited input from key stakeholders for revising the Comprehensive Conservation Management Plan for the Delaware Estuary (CCMP).

PHASE 1: EXPERT STAKEHOLDER INPUT

Input was solicited from approximately 300 scientists and experts on topics related to *Healthy Waters, Healthy Habitats, and Healthy Communities*, the thematic areas proposed for the revised CCMP. (These thematic areas later became ***Clean Waters, Healthy Habitats, and Strong Communities***.)

In Spring 2016, over 150 of these experts provided responses to a series of open-ended questions on actions underway and actions needed to address these topics. Input was also received from three public listening sessions held in Summer 2016 for feedback on a basic set of draft goals for each theme. PDE compiled all feedback into an “Ideas Document,” along with additional feedback collected from its Science and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) and Estuary Implementation Committee (EIC) in Fall 2016. Over 1,700 ideas were collected and categorized into this document, for their suitability as final CCMP actions.

Following this initial stakeholder process, the same experts were invited to participate in a series of workshops to further refine the Ideas Document for inclusion in goals, strategies, and actions of the revised CCMP. Information gathered at the nine CCMP Expert Workshops was used to create a “Core Elements” document, a rough outline of goals and strategies for the revised CCMP. The Core Elements Document made it possible to undertake an assessment to identify whether the preliminary strategies were vulnerable to climate change. To undertake a climate vulnerability assessment for the preliminary strategies, PDE held a series of workshops to gather further input from experts. The climate vulnerability assessment provided PDE with an opportunity to further vet preliminary strategies with expert stakeholders in order to ensure that the Delaware Estuary Program is thoughtfully investing time, effort, and resources in strategies that will continue to be meaningful and important in the face of climate change stressors.

Once the climate vulnerability assessment was complete, the Estuary Implementation Committee (EIC) and the Steering Committee (SC) worked to further refine the Core Elements based on feedback and discussion, and created a document available for review to a broader group of partners and constituents.

PHASE 2: LOCAL/PARTNER STAKEHOLDER INPUT

With the refined Core Elements in-hand, PDE embarked on the Phase 2 Stakeholder Engagement effort designed to obtain input from a broader group of local stakeholders and partners. The goal of this effort was to explain the CCMP revision process, to have stakeholders review the Core Elements strategies, and to provide various opportunities for feedback. There were three types of engagement opportunities: open houses, presentations to stakeholder groups, and public feedback via the PDE website. The Core Elements document made available to stakeholders participating in this process is included here as Appendix A.

Participants were provided with a comment form with the following questions asked for each of the three themes (*Clean Water, Healthy Habitats, and Strong Communities*):

- Which of these strategies would or would not work here?
- Is something missing that you think is important?

- Do you have ideas for how we can implement these strategies in your area?
- Are there potential partners or innovative new things in your area that we might not be aware of?

OPEN HOUSES

The goal of the open houses was to explain the CCMP revision process, to have stakeholders review the Core Elements strategies, and to provide opportunity for feedback.

Open Houses were planned and facilitated by the consulting firm RK&K, with input from PDE and the EIC, and logistical assistance from PDE. Eight open houses were held in the fall of 2017 at the following dates, times, and locations, and attracted the following number of participants:

Date	Time	Venue	Location	# of Participants
9/12	11:30 – 1:30	Tulpehaking Nature Center	Trenton, NJ	11
9/12	4:30 – 6:30	Silver Lake Nature Center	Bristol, PA	14
9/13	4:30 – 6:30	Hildacy Preserve	Media, PA	3
9/19	4:30 – 6:30	Ashland Nature Center	Hockessin, DE	11
9/26	11:30 – 1:30	Viriden Center	Lewes, DE	12
9/28	11:30 – 1:30	Camden County Environmental Center	Cherry Hill, NJ	10
9/28	4:30 – 6:30	Bartram's Garden	Philadelphia, PA	10
10/5	4:30 – 6:30	Bayshore Center at Bivalve	Port Norris, NJ	21

The locations were selected to ensure that stakeholders from various geographies were afforded opportunities to participate. These locations were also intended to include areas with the largest number of PDE stakeholders, partners, and Estuary News subscribers.

OPEN HOUSE COMMUNICATIONS

PDE advertised the open houses in several different ways.

Method of Advertisement	Metrics
WHYY 90.9 FM radio - 13 30-second underwriting ads on Newsworks using PDE advertising credits.	~580,000 listeners per week
League of Conservation Voters – sent emails two weeks prior to each open house to PA and NJ list.	~ 2500 on the list serve
PDE Summer newsletter - Full-page article with dates of each open house listed.	Mailed and shipped 23,635 print copies, with hundreds more available as handouts at Pennsylvania Coast Day and elsewhere
PDE E-newsletter - emailed end of August as an e-newsletter to PDEs email contacts	7,289 people
Google Calendar - Each open house was listed on PDE's website, both on the Google Calendar and as an event post	8,113 unique visitors per month, on average
PDE current donors - One-page invitation mailed over Labor Day as part of fall donor memo	1,200 people

PDE Mass email on August 17 inviting attendance at open house with list of dates; follow up email to full listserv sent September 25	Opened by 14.6% of our full listserv (7,289 people), or 1,074 readers
Twitter - Each open house was posted on Twitter using eight tweets tagging each meeting venue	1,499 followers
Facebook - Each state's open houses was posted using three posts that tag each meeting venue	3,364 likes
Linked-in - Posted on August 22	232 followers

In addition to these outreach methods, updates were given by PDE staff at regularly-scheduled meetings of multiple groups that PDE typically attends (like cluster group meetings, SAN meetings, or Bayshore Coalition meetings). Additionally, partners helped to promote the open houses via email, on their websites, and on their social media accounts.

OPEN HOUSE AGENDA

The open houses were set up to allow participants the flexibility to participate in a manner that they were able. Each open house ran for two hours, from 11:30 to 1:30 (to invite a lunch crowd), or from 4:30 to 6:30 (to invite an after-work crowd).

Open houses had four stations with information. The first station, the Welcome Station, greeted guests as they walked in the door. There was a sign-in sheet, an informational brochure, a questionnaire form (to be brought with participants to each station), copies of the Core Elements document, and a selection of light refreshments. The other three stations were subject-matter stations—one each for *Clean Waters*, *Healthy Habitats*, and *Strong Communities*. These stations each had two posters- one with an introduction to the theme, and one with the theme's Core Elements. PDE team members were situated at the Welcome Station and around the room to engage participants and provide additional information as needed.

Forty-five minutes into the open house, team members began a presentation. The presentation provided an overview of the CCMP and revision process to date, and reviewed the Core Elements and the goals of the open house. The presentation was followed by a facilitated group discussion about the Core Elements. During the presentation and facilitated group discussion, the stations remained open. Following the group discussion, participants were urged to continue reviewing the information at the stations and to turn in comment sheets with any additional input.

SUMMARY OF ALL OPEN HOUSE COMMENTS

There were two methods of collecting feedback during the open houses: through the comment sheets and through facilitated group discussion following the presentation. The summary that follows is a review of both. For detailed notes and results from comment sheets, please see Appendix B.

Overall, participants approved of the Core Elements document; by and large, they saw the Core Elements document as too general and were interested in digging deeper into strategies and offering recommendations for strategy focal areas and actions. The recommendations for core element/strategy wording changes are listed here.

RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO STRATEGIES/STRATEGY WORDING

Goal/Strategy	Core Element Wording	Comments
W 2.4	Coordinate and promote research and monitoring efforts (chemical, physical, biological) associated with the causes of water quality impacts throughout the Delaware Estuary.	Too broad.
W 3	Sustain Flow for Drinking Water and Ecosystems	Should say, "Sustain flow to decrease impacts to drinking water and ecosystems." Should be listed first (as W 1).
W 3.5	Promote and assist in implementing Regional Sediment Management	Should include the word "toxins."
C 1.1	Restore working waterfronts	Should say, "Create economic uplift for low-income waterfronts by restoring critical and native habitats" Should say, " Identify and restore working waterfronts."
C 1.3	Protect and enhance natural areas and public access	Should say, "Protect and enhance communities , natural areas, and public access."
C 2.2	Utilize events to increase stewardship and engage new people and communities	Should say, "Utilize events to increase stewardship and engagement new people and diverse communities."
H 2	Stem Forest Loss	Description should better reflect the specific goal. Should include the words "restore"
H 3	Increase and Improve Fish and Shellfish Habitat	Too specific, should be "Increase and improve estuarine habitats ."
H 3.4	Protect and restore horseshoe crabs and their habitat	Should include protecting beaches for communities.

Please note that these comments do not necessarily represent a group consensus. These comments were made by individuals and may or may not have been confirmed by the group at large.

SUMMARY OF TOPICS OF INTEREST

Most time during the open house discussions and most space on comment sheets was dedicated to recommending focal areas for Core Element strategies. Many people across open houses and comment sheets commented on the following topics:

- Establishing baselines, especially for water
- Support for land use planning, especially to curb the impact that development has on water quality

- Creating a central repository for information and current projects in the watershed
- Creating opportunities for technology transfer both from outside and within the Delaware Estuary watershed, especially for small organizations (for natural infrastructure solutions) and coastal communities (for resilience)
- Including invasive species in the CCMP
- Supporting the green economy, specifically promoting jobs and investment in green infrastructure and ecotourism
- Including climate change and resilience in the CCMP
- Concern for funding
- Interest in seeing connections between CCMP strategies clearly represented in the document
- Including Departments of Transportation as partners, particularly for habitat goals
- Outreach
 - o Working with municipalities
 - o Working with businesses and industries
 - o Outreach on plastics (bags, microbeads, etc.)
- Research
 - o Tying economics and value to ecosystem services
 - o On emerging contaminants

LIST OF RECOMMENDED PARTNERS:

BUSINESS

- | | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| - Business community | - Sports Teams |
| - Industrial | - Resource Environmental Solutions |
| - Port of Wilmington | - Utilities (including American Water) |
| - Maritime/port entities | - Manufacturing |
| - Fisheries | - Green Solutions (out of Millsboro DE) |
| - Waterfront-related businesses | - Sustainable Energy Utility |
| - Kalmar Nykel | |

COMMUNICATIONS

- | | |
|------------------|-------|
| - Radio stations | - PBS |
| - Comcast | |

NONPROFITS, ALLIANCES, AND INITIATIVES

- | | |
|--|--|
| - Heritage Conservancy Friends of the Delaware Canal | - NJ Climate Adaptation Alliance |
| - Delaware Riverkeeper | - Delaware Bay Oyster Restoration Task Force |
| - Climate and Urban Systems Partnership (CUSP) | - Economic Development Groups |
| - Delaware River Watershed Initiative (DRWI) | - Stroud Water Resources Center |
| - National Wildlife Foundation (NWF) | - William Penn Foundation |
| - Association of Bayshore Communities | - Watershed associations |
| - Audubon | - Camden Green Ambassador |
| | - NJ Climate Alliance (Rutgers University) |
| | - Clean Air Council |

- PA Horticulture Society
- South Jersey Bayshore Coalition
- Interfaith Power and Light
- NJ Watershed Ambassadors

- Bayshore Heritage Byway
- Delaware's Bayshore Byway
- Pine Barrens Scenic Byway

RECREATIONAL AND HOBBYIST GROUPS

- Master Gardeners
- Master Naturalists

- PA Watershed Stewards
- Boating and fishing groups

PROFESSIONAL SOCIETIES

- Ecological Society of America

- Society of Wetland Scientists

SITES

- Nature Centers
- Churches

- Museums (including Academy of Natural Sciences of Drexel University)
- National Parks

EDUCATION

- Network of Elementary Science Teachers
- Private School Teachers
- Alliance for Watershed Education

- University Agricultural Extensions
- Universities (including UDel- forestry, UDel Water Resources Agency)

GOVERNMENT ENTITIES

- Bucks County Conservation District
- Departments of Transportation (including DelDOT for habitat work in particular)
- Departments of Agriculture
- Mercer County Park Commission (forestry work)
- US Forest Service

- NOAA
- Agricultural Resource Center in Newark
- USFWS
- USACE
- NRCS
- National Park Service
- Larger municipalities

SUMMARY OF EACH OPEN HOUSE

The following is a summary of the input received during discussions and on comment sheets at the open houses. This information will be relevant in crafting language in CCMP actions.

TULPEHAKING NATURE CENTER

Participants at the Tulpehaking Nature Center were interested in how the CCMP could use history and cultural heritage to strengthen the connection that people have to their waterways. The area has long been involved with archaeological studies, and participants were well-versed in the history of their region. There was a clear consensus among the group that the CCMP actions related to waterfronts should include historic waterfronts, and not just "working" ones.

Attendees engaged in discussion around the idea of access and what it meant. To attendees, publicly-accessible green spaces, forests, and waterfront areas are important. So, too, is how people would access

those spaces (e.g., through public transportation), and how safe they would feel once they arrive. Participants observed that it's not enough just to have these locations—for people to want to use them, they have to feel safe and that their needs are met in those spaces.

This venue was located geographically the farthest north of the open house series (at the upper end of the estuary), and participants were interested in having the boundaries of the Delaware Estuary study area extend farther northward to include additional forested habitat and communities in this area.

SILVER LAKE NATURE CENTER

At the Silver Lake Nature Center, the discussion began with an interest in citizen science, and wove back and forth through that topic throughout the open house. Participants wanted to use citizen science to empower the public to understand and monitor drinking water. Participants also wanted to harness the power of citizen science to better track water pollution. The interest in pollution trends didn't stop there—participants were also interested in inventorying brownfields and historic industrial sites to determine their impact on water quality, including an action on toxins, and better defining what is meant by “healthy water.”

Attendees were also interested in creating employment opportunities with the green economy—they wanted to see green jobs included more explicitly in the CCMP, and there was emphasis placed on entry-level employment. Attendees were also interested in engaging more in the political realm, educating legislators, providing evidence for legislative change, and having the public sign on to petitions.

HILDACY PRESERVE

The limited number of attendees at the Hildacy Preserve Open House allowed for a more in-depth conversation on issues of concern for participants. The group discussed issues of race, inclusion, exclusion, and diversity in environmental institutions and movements. Attendees felt strongly that the environmental world has not been good at encouraging participation from or voices of people of color, and that it is imperative to increase diversity in environmental institutions moving forward. They felt that diversity in environmental institutions is needed in order to engage diverse stakeholders. Participants wanted to call out that there have been many stakeholders historically left out of environmental conversations, and asked that action C2.2 include the words “engage diverse communities.”

Participants at this open house were also interested in including information about plastics in the CCMP. They were surprised not to see the word “plastic” in the Core Elements, and believe that it would be an important item that the public could latch onto and support. Actions about microbeads and plastic bags were suggested.

ASHLAND NATURE CENTER

Participants at Ashland Nature Center were very interested in outreach and working with businesses and industries in the watershed, habitats not directly identified in the core elements, and forest habitat quality. In terms of working with businesses and industries, participants discussed at length the benefit of involving local corporations, particularly those with roots in the region or those with unique industries. The benefit, they believed, included opportunities to work together on projects and to develop stronger ties that would allow for outreach work to help implement BMPs.

Regarding impressions on Healthy Habitats, participants discussed at length the avian and mammal species not addressed directly by the CCMP. There was concern that Goal H3 regarding fish and shellfish

were too focused on PDE goals and not the needs of the estuary program. Participants were interested in including other habitats and other species, and recommended that Goal H3 be expanded to encompass estuarine habitats in general.

Finally, participants at Ashland were interested in better clarifying goals around forest habitat. Participants indicated that stemming forest loss may not be the most focused goal. Instead, they argued, the forest strategies should focus on improving forest habitat quality and reducing forest fragmentation.

VIRDEN CENTER

Participants at the Virden Center focused on issues related to the green economy and the possibility of supporting technology transfer both from outside and within the Delaware Estuary watershed. In regards to the green economy, Virden Center attendees were interested in developing more green jobs from green infrastructure installation and from ecotourism. They were also interested in better understanding and doing outreach around ecosystem service value. There was also a discussion about supporting microbreweries and marketing them as part of the ecotourism network because of their interest in local clean water.

Technology transfer ideas ran the gamut from horseshoe crab restoration efforts in Japan to considering efforts from the Delaware Center for Inland Bays on stormwater runoff BMPs to having coastal communities assist one another with resilience efforts. Supporting land use planning conversations between counties in Delaware was also a topic of discussion.

CAMDEN COUNTY ENVIRONMENTAL CENTER

At Camden County Environmental Center, attendees were largely focused on issues pertaining to clean water and what was perceived as an absence of climate change topics in the core elements document. Participants were very interested in ensuring that drinking water issues were front and center in the CCMP, both because drinking water is a topic that the public readily understands, and because it enables the discussion of other relevant issues around contaminants and flow. Attendees were interested in clear outreach strategies connecting drinking water to other water issues, as well as restoration efforts through green infrastructure. They also believed that urban areas and large municipalities should be the focus of green infrastructure installations and outreach efforts. Related to this, supporting green jobs (and programs that train or support a green job workforce) was seen as a priority.

Participants were surprised by the lack of language regarding climate change and climate change impacts in the core elements document. They were interested in seeing more information regarding research to be undertaken to better understand the impacts of climate change (especially on water pollution) and the urgency of establishing baselines due to the alterations in water quality and habitat composition and acreage from impacts. Attendees were interested in seeing more around habitat and community resiliency in the core elements.

BARTRAM'S GARDEN

Attendees at Bartram's Garden were interested in issues around advocacy and outreach. Participants wanted advocacy included in the CCMP: advocacy education and direct advocacy (especially around the topic of water pollution violators). Participants want more discussion around current and alternative energy practices, and want to partner with small nonprofits doing on-the-ground work with

environmental justice communities and community health. There was group discussion around the concept of doing outreach with success stories related to issues in the Core Elements document.

BAYSHORE CENTER AT BIVALVE

At the Bayshore Center at Bivalve, participants were interested in capturing accurate baselines of resources and current conditions, and having that information be readily shareable with the public. Participants were also interested in focusing efforts on areas not covered by work of other groups. Several times during discussion, attendees recommended looking for geographic gaps in work being conducted by other groups, and ensuring that those areas (and resources) were included in the CCMP. (An example of a geographic gap could be areas not included in Delaware River Watershed Initiative's clusters.) Attendees also discussed better capturing connections between strategies and goals in the Core Elements document. Participants were excited by the number of connections between Clean Waters, Healthy Habitats, and Strong Communities, but thought that these connections should be better represented in the CCMP. Goals and strategies that better connect all the goals should be prioritized. Participants pointed out wetland restoration work in Healthy Habitats as being important for water quality and strong communities. Finally, open house attendees were also interested in opportunities for technology transfer and information sharing around regional planning efforts on both the New Jersey Bayshore and Delaware Bayshore. Participants wanted to hear about success stories and lessons learned from their counterparts across the Bay.

STAKEHOLDER PRESENTATIONS

During the same time period that Open Houses were held, PDE staff were included in agendas for regular meetings of a variety of stakeholder groups to discuss the Core Elements for a revised CCMP. Similar materials were used for these engagements as for the Open Houses, with limited time permitted for discussion/feedback at most. Information about these meetings and a summary of the input provided at them can be found below. Where written comments were collected, those are included in Appendix B. For meetings where a sign-in sheet was not collected, an approximated number of participants has been included, and is indicated with a tilde.

Date	Venue	Location	Type of Interaction	# of Participants
8/24	Philadelphia Cluster of Delaware River Watershed Initiative*	Philadelphia, PA	Presentation	~10
8/30	NJ Delaware Bayshore Council August Board Meeting	Dennis Township Municipal Hall in NJ	Presentation and discussion	18
9/7	PDE Board Meeting	Wilmington, DE	Presentation	~15
9/14	Water Resources Association of the Delaware River Basin Board Meeting	Lambertville PA	Presentation and discussion	~15
9/15	South Jersey Bayshore Coalition	Millville NJ	Presentation	11

9/15	StateImpact & NJSpotlight The Delaware River Watershed: Protecting Today and Tomorrow	Camden NJ	Presentation	~30
9/18	Joint STAC and EIC meeting	Philadelphia PA	Presentation, feedback from STAC	~30
9/20	Schuylkill Action Network Bus Tour*	Schuylkill Watershed	Brief remarks with invitation to send comments	~20
9/22	Schuylkill Action Network Education and Outreach Work Group	Fairmount Waterworks in Philadelphia, PA	Presentation and discussion	7
9/25	Upper Lehigh Cluster of the Delaware River Watershed Initiative*	Wildland Conservancy's Air Products Environmental Education Center in Emmaus, PA	Presentation and discussion	10
10/11	Experience the Estuary Celebration	Claymont, DE	Brief remarks; table with information and comment sheets	~400
10/17	Delaware River Watershed Forum		Presentation	~50

* Multiple mass and targeted emails were sent to members and clusters/workgroups of the Schuylkill Action Network and Delaware River Watershed Initiative to invite input.

Comments received from the Stakeholder Presentation engagement work included recommendations on outreach (outreach to entities like private developments, waterfront development corporations, and businesses; as well as on topics like trail access, ecosystem service values, and riparian buffers), clarifying definitions (like “community” and “technical assistance”), and increasing public access. Comments for *Healthy Habitats* focused on dam removal and restoration of fish passage, and creating a plan to acquire forest stewardship funding. One discussion also included a recommendation to identify and pursue designations that could help to create funding and support for important areas (like “Sentinel Landscape”).

ONLINE COMMENTS

CCMP revision feedback was invited at additional meetings where PDE staff were in attendance and available to present material on the CCMP revision process, without time for discussion. This feedback was emailed or submitted online anonymously. An online google form was posted on the PDE website as an open platform to gather ongoing feedback on the CCMP revision and was posted online in August 2017.

Much like the comments received and ideas discussed during the open houses, comments collected online largely seemed to accept the general framework of the Core Elements document and instead recommended topics for particular CCMP actions. One comment, however, referred specifically to the

CCMP process, and indicated that missing stakeholders (of different racial and ethnic origins) was the result of systemic racism.

The comments received regarding *Clean Waters* focused on topics that commenters wished to see in the CCMP, as well as research and outreach opportunities they believed were important. Toxics and emerging contaminants were requested to be included, as they are seen as impacting the health of low-income populations. Research on persistent organic pollutants (such as C8 and C9) that are resistant to environmental degradation was requested. Finally, a commenter requested that outreach to the agricultural community be included in the CCMP.

Comments received on the topic of *Healthy Habitats* focused on prioritization, regulation, research, and monitoring needs. One comment stated that habitats other than the ones currently in the Core Elements document need to be included in the CCMP, and another comment stated that the Core Elements need to be more inclusive of beach and shoreline habitat, which need to be protected in order to reduce marsh loss behind them. One commenter wanted to generally prioritize habitat areas for preservation and restoration, and others wanted more detail for forest (specifically, working to change forest regulation that creates monocultures of trees, and mapping ghost forests as a measure of saltwater intrusion) or fish and shellfish (researching impingement and entrainment, and supplementing populations of fish and shellfish with lab-grown larvae). Finally, one commenter was interested in removal of invasive species using volunteer labor, and another wanted general research regarding the impact that sea level rise has on watershed resources.

Strong Communities comments were largely skewed to topics involving coastal communities. Commenters wanted the CCMP to focus on work with coastal communities, and especially to support municipalities working to address flood protection. One commenter was interested in promoting land use planning to help revitalize urban areas and redirect growth from sensitive natural areas.

Anonymous commenters recommended working with the following partners/groups:

- National Park Service
- State Planning Offices
- NJ Audubon Society
- RAMSAR Convention
- Fishing and hunting groups like Ducks Unlimited, Delta Waterfowl, Bass Delaware River Fisherman's Association
- American Water
- Camden County Municipal Utility Authority
- NJ Climate Alliance
- Agricultural Research Services Newark
- NJ Watershed Ambassadors

NEXT STEPS

This document is provided for the Estuary Implementation Committee's (EIC) consideration as it works with PDE staff to review and complete a first draft of the revised CCMP for the Delaware Estuary. Anticipated next steps include: 1) discussion of these results by the EIC within the next 1-2 months to

determine if/what comments received warrant new/additional language in the draft revised CCMP, and 2) incorporation of warranted input/ideas in a draft revised CCMP for Steering Committee review and approval in early 2018. This draft will serve as the basis for a third and final phase of stakeholder engagement in the CCMP revision process, anticipated in mid-2018.

SUMMARY OF PHASE 2 STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

Appendix A

Core Elements at the Open Houses and Stakeholder Presentations