## CBP Goal Implementation Team

## Enhanced Partnering, Leadership, and Management



## Meeting Agenda + Meeting Minutes

## 

**Date:** February 4th, 2014

**Time:** 1:00pm – 2:30pm

**Location:** Conference Call, Room 303 at CBPO

**Call-in:** (866)-299-3188

**Code:** 410-267-5731

**Adobe Connect Link:** <https://epa.connectsolutions.com/git6>

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Members Roll Call:**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Greg Allen, EPA | Sarah Diebel, DOD | Jennifer Pauer, WV DEP | | Greg Barranco, EPA | Matt Fleming, MD DNR | Marel Raub, CBC (\*Jack Frye) | | Russ Baxter, VA DEQ | Mike Foreman, VA DCR, **Chair** | John Schneider, DE DNREC | | Carin Bisland, EPA, **vice-Chair** | Pat Gleason, EPA | Nita Sylvester, EPA | | Jessica Blackburn, ACB (CAC Liaison) | Kirk Havens, VIMS (STAC Liaison) | Doreen Vetter, EPA | | Andy Zemba, PA DEP | Carl Hershner, VIMS | Tim Wilke, CBP/CRC | | Brian Burch, EPA | Jackie Lendrum, NY DEC (\*Ben Sears) | Mary Gattis, LGAC | | Diane Davis, DC DOE | Lori Mackey, EPA | Tim Roberts, EPA | | Kevin Debell, EPA | Michael Mason, EPA |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  | | | |  |  |
| **Agenda Item** **and Desired Outcome** | Time | Background Docs, Notes, and Action Items |
| **Introductions & Chesapeake Stat Discussion (Discussion Lead: Greg Allen & Doreen Vetter)** | 1:00 – 1:05 | ChesapeakeStat Discussion:   * **Action:** Doreen requested 45 minutes on the next GIT 6 agenda to continue ChesapeakeStat discussion. Doreen will also provide more details on the March 12 work session as it becomes available. * Sept. 2012 – business case to improve ChesapeakeStat * Redesigning to make more relevant to target users * Getting ready to transform the site after new agreement to better track progress towards goals and outcomes and, ultimately management strategies and funding sources to support those strategies * Completed research phase on website, looking at other comparable sites, and usability testing. * Currently in Discovery Phase, interviewing targeted users and conducting focus groups * 45 minutes @ next GIT 6 meeting to go through process more thoroughly and have contractor present results of Discovery * May be some decision points that would like GIT 6 input on related to what information is needed on the site, and potential conflicting needs to be resolved * Next step after March 4th GIT 6 meeting will be to get back together for an in person meeting run by the contractor on March 12th to discuss information architecture of the new site. * Jessica Blackburn, Matt Fleming, Mike Mason, Marel Raub, and Mary Gattis expressed interest in attending the March ChesapeakeStat meeting. * We will continue to discuss how GIT6 can be involved in the feedback and re-development process. |
| **Update on Chesapeake Watershed Agreement (Discussion Leads: Carin Bisland & Greg Barranco & Margaret Enloe)**  Recap of status of finalizing Chesapeake Watershed Agreement. Revisit timeline (development schedule) for Chesapeake Watershed Agreement in 2014. Discuss any changes or actions relevant to GIT6.  Explain upcoming public comment period and determine GIT’s role. | 1:05– 1:25 | General Public Comment Process Discussion:   * EC met on December 12th. That version was sent out for public comment because EC members wanted to hear from public before making changes. Further, they wanted to stick to the timeline presented to them (45 day comment period beginning January 29) * Signing agreement in June/July timeframe at an EC meeting * The agreement has a specialized URL: chesapeakebay.net/watershedagreement * Specific email address for agreement comments agreement@chespeakebay.net * CBP communications staff has a protocol for how those emails are captured and handled * Comments received are captured and put into a larger spreadsheet (similar to last public comment period where comments will be sorted by topic) * Will set exact period of time for March 13th MB meeting for public comment session * Will do social media promotion about public comment period * Nick will submit opinion piece * Currently, concern that toxics are not currently reflected in the draft Agreement is the most frequent public comment, followed by concern for climate change * Will try to track citizen comments by jurisdiction in this public comment period. Since we will be using the computer IP address, this method may not be completely accurate (it only tells us where the computer is, not necessarily the location of interest to the commenter) but will give a good indication.   Public Comment Meetings Discussion:   * **Action:** Margaret will provide talking points that can be used by anyone who is speaking to the public about the Agreement. These talking points will provide consistency in messaging. * **Action:** Matt Fleming will talk to Margaret & Carin about suggested public meeting structure * **Action:** Matt Fleming will share ideas for posters to be used at public comment meetings (plus possible way to transport between DC & MD meeting) * **Action:** GIT members should visitMD’s virtual tour website for tips on how to prepare for the public listening sessions: <http://www.dnr.state.md.us/ccp/coastal_resources/oceanplanning/virtualopenhouse.asp> * **Action:** CBPO willclarify on bay agreement website “if you have questions about the listening session email Diane Davis” vs. “if you want your comment tracked on the actual agreement then go to this URL” * **Action:** Margaret Enloe will work on developing a clear set of guidelines (speaking limits, time, etc) for March 13th public comment session * **Key Point:** CBP staff can be present at all public listening sessions at the jurisdiction’s discretion to help take notes and answer questions asked at in-person meetings. * **Key Point:** Commenters will be asked to submit comments in writing so that comments are not misrepresented. Notes from public comment in-person meetings will only be used internally and not added to the public comment page. * **Key Point:** “please be advised to bring a laptop to submit comments via CBP system to be officially recorded” should be included in reminder email to the public * **Key Point:** Mike Foreman will look into whether VA will want to have a public comment meeting / listening session? * It was suggested laptops be provided at the public sessions for formal comment submission. * MD is considering extending public comment meeting to run from 4pm-8pm |
| **Follow up on Governance Issues Discussed By PSC (Discussion Lead: Carin Bisland)**  Update goal team members on schedule and scope of revisiting Chesapeake Bay Program governance in response to discussion at PSC meeting.  Discuss particular focus regarding voting issues and participation in management strategies, and determine GIT6’s role. | 1:25– 1:55 | Governance Discussion:   * **Action:** Carin will send out PSC actions & decisions that lists key governance issues once we receive final approval from chair (will be sent to all PSC members and interested parties list) * **Action:** Margaret Enloe will work out the details for advanced registration for the March 13th MB public comment session. * **Key Point:** There was a question about if members of the public needed to pre-register for the public comment portion of the March 13th MB meeting. The group determined that everyone should register in advance to help determine how much time will be allotted to the public comment portion of the agenda. * Current Governance issues ---- * When do we use consensus? * When do we vote via supermajority? * Supermajority of signatories or supermajority of wider group? * Approval or adoption of management strategies – who will be responsible for this? * How and when do we revise management strategies? * There was a question about the current definition of a supermajority is within the CBP for voting purposes. In response to a group question it was clarified that 7/9 or more signatories voting yes is considered a supermajority. The PSC is discussing potentially expanding the definition of supermajority to incorporate a larger group of CBP partners. * Need to define under what circumstances supermajority could be used – define stipulations and limitations * The EC directed the PSC to resolve key governance issues to ensure a common understanding of how the CBP will work to carry out the commitments in the Agreement prior to requesting the EC to sign the Agreement. Codifying those resolutions in an updated Governance document can then be done by the Program. This new Governance document does not necessarily need to be completed prior to signing the Agreement. |
| **Evaluator Function Workgroup Update (Discussion Lead: Greg Allen)**  Explain how workgroup is building out a document to describe the differences between Performance Assessment vs. Program Evaluation and how the workgroup will identify any current Performance Assessment or Program Evaluation mechanisms within the Chesapeake Bay Program.  Discuss potential impact on original PSC charge and whether the GIT will need to ask the PSC for a revised charge. | 1:55– 2:25 | Evaluator Function Discussion:   * **Action:** Make arrow on diagram’s comparison table flow both ways (assessment and evaluation feed into each other) * **Action:** Tim Wilke and Greg Allen will put together water quality example * **Action:** Will present Mike Mason’s slides to 3/4/14 GIT6 meeting * **Decision:** The team decidedno new charge needed from PSC as the current work is consistent with the charge which asked for the GIT to look @ gaps within the Bay Program * **Key Point:** GIT 6 should ensure an understanding of the difference between program evaluation & performance assessment as well as providing our recommendation on how to proceed with the evaluator function * **Key Point:** Evaluator Workgroup can provide guidance on how to determine when an evaluation should be internal or external but it will be up to the MB or PSC to make that determination * Group was tasked to define distinction between program evaluation & performance assessment * Internal/external will be a theme later on * Workgroup will narrow evaluation down to list of options * The new slides provided by Mike Mason show how both program evaluation and performance assessment interact----they are supposed to be complementary functions. * The workgroup will try to provide something by next GIT6 meeting to further clarify the differences between performance assessment and program evaluation |
| **Action Items, Next Meeting (Discussion Lead: Tim Wilke)** | 2:25 – 2:30 |  |