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**Actions and Decisions**

**Executive Council Follow-Up**

Action: Correspondence between the Executive Council and the Whitehouse will occur to communicate what the EC’s priorities are.

**Midpoint Assessment and the TMDL**

Decision:

**Environmental Finance Symposium**

Action: Topic will be presented to the PSC at the December meeting with an in-depth discussion of the recommendations. PSC members should be prepared to present who will represent their jurisdiction or agency on the Action Team during the discussion.

Action: In addition, the PSC agreed that a survey/doodle poll will be sent out to the membership within the next week for an opportunity to provide comments on the recommendations. The PSC will have 2 weeks to submit feedback.

**Meeting Discussion**

**Executive Council Follow-up – Molly Ward**

*Ann Swanson, Chesapeake Bay Commission (CBC):* The thing that would help us is if LGAC could help us gather the information to better understand the request. Through meetings or written materials to gather that info then we can go to our member states and discuss with them.

*Charlie Stek, Citizens’ Advisory Committee (CAC)*: it doesn’t begin with Congress it begins with the Whitehouse who puts together the budget for next year. It’s important for the EC to communicate to the Whitehouse for what the priorities are. It’s not just limited to local dollars. Local governments ought to receive a greater share of funding. Start at the national level.

*Molly Ward, PSC Chair*: the letter should be a broader letter and we should consider sending it to the Whitehouse and starting there. Are people comfortable with Charlie’s suggestion?

**Decision**: **Will proceed on Charlies suggestion and the LGAC proposal.**

**On the Horizon: Put on the next EC agenda what type of outreach we’re doing and what type of PSAs that have been/ are being done.**

*Charlie*: how to tap into the priorities; Money is available but if the agencies don’t pursue those dollars they won’t be available (regarding the Every child succeeds act)

*Ann*: in GIT funding, would it be possible to have a grant write in env. literacy and work with the states.

*Charlie*: there is that effort underway now, Kevin Maxwell is leading that effort throughout the country. Partnered with another state superintendent. He’s trying to engage all local superintendents of schools to make sure they’re aware of this funding and how to access them. There are efforts out there to engage local but if the state superintendents of schools are not pursuing this and making it a priority it’s not going to work. Need to follow up on the Summit that happened earlier this year. There’s a higher level discussion, Congress will come back into session and there’s a huge gap between what the Senate funds are for the child succeeds act vs the House. We want the higher level of dollars so there’s more money to spread around.

*Nick DiPasquale, EPA*: Charlie and I have talked about this. I think we need to develop a multi prong strategy. Need to sit down with the env. literacy workgorup. Concerned about using GIT funding if it means bringing on more staff. The WQGIT has webinars which are an effective way to get info out to a lot of people with a small resource of staff. Would be able to reach more bodies.

*Bruce Williams, Local Government Advisory Committee (LGAC)*: look forward to exploring the technical gaps at the December LGAC meeting

*Dave Goshorn, MD DNR*: For env. literacy in Maryland, the effort is run through a multi-agency program through DNR. Did appreciate the points Charlie made.

*Patrick McDonnell, PA DEP*: one of the things that struck me coming in on earlier meetings, some residents not understanding there is a water quality problem. I definitely want to be connecting on the dollars out there. It’s everyone’s problem to understand and not something down or upstream from us. Anything we can do, the capacity element of this is an important piece.

*Charlie*: one superintendent at the Summit said that they work down the street from agencies but they don’t talk to one another. It’s trying to bring local, federal, and state partners together. Want them to understand what our priorities are so they know what there’s should be.

*Nick*: when the summit occurred there was some discussion of the ability for federal agencies to access this funding, we could use that support for the env. education WG to help fund their efforts. Can the bay program go after some of that funding?

*Charlie*: not sure, the guidance is worth exploring though.

*Ben Grumbles, MDE*: make sure we don’t lose sight of the fact that we still have the unresolved funding issue on the Independent Evaluator (IE) component. Don’t want it to come a mountain when it’s currently a molehill, if we can come to terms with that since there’s a law requiring us to do it. Not saying we should stop talking about env. literacy, but if we’re talking about funding, and communications to the Whitehouse I think the IE funding issue is something that we need to look at

**Midpoint assessment and the TMDL: James Davis-Martin and Lucinda Power**

The overall schedule calls for the model to be completed in March and until May to complete the review. There could be a challenge getting the review approved by the PSC depending on the meeting schedule.

*Patrick McDonnell*: at the EC meeting, the PA Governor talked about the cost effectiveness of this. As we proceed, we have some other tools we’re going to be proceeding in parallel and hopefully in advance to give us some insight. Want to make sure we’re not just having the discussion theoretically but how cost effectiveness comes in and what tools can be used to move this forward.

*Shawn Garvin, EPA*: the notion that we’re going to constantly learn, none of this is so rigid that we’re just stuck on this is how we’re going to do it. This evolution will continue to happen. Want to make sure we maintain the efforts past 2025.

*Rich Batiuk, CBP EPA*: Regarding the Methodology; something we have now is the ability to look at the cost and the effectiveness. Can look at optimization and a framework to start doing what Patrick has asked. We have a good solid framework to bring in additional information into it. We can bring back to the table in December and May.

*Patrick*: for PA, we need to solve some local water quality impacts and the cost effectiveness there.

*Chuck Hunt, NPS*: federal facilities, how will they plug into the phase III WIPs?

*James Davis-Martin, VA DEQ/GIT 3*: there isn’t clarity. The Federal Facilities Workgroup (FFWG) is having discussions as to what that should look like.

*Sarah Diebel, DOD Navy*: we have EPA’s expectations of the WIPs. At the last MB meeting we had a discussion as to how federal facilities can be addressed in the phase 3 WIPs. We can use help understanding some of the specific decision points we might need to make in alignment with the WQGIT.

*Jim Edward, CBP EPA*: received preliminary draft comments, particularly EPAs role. The working draft, we’ve added a section of EPAs role and clarify our role with working with federal facilities and the targets developed. Next draft coming out in January.

*Rich*: challenges in federal facilities with stormwater and agriculture.

*Ben*: not all federal facilities are created equally. Don’t want the moment to pass without saying that’s a really important component on the federal facilities opportunities. It’s more of a solutions oriented tool but fortunate for us that Col. Chamberlayne is looking at the broader Chesapeake Bay.

*Nick*: planning targets and climate change, respect to differential impacts. Curious how the planning targets will be able to accommodate that?

*James*: the 2010 scenarios are still run at the same model and scale so in theory those differential effects could be run if we feel confident in those values. Even if it is variably, we could still incorporate it into the modeling system similarly like we’ve done for air deposition. Could apply into the system climate change in concept.

*Shawn*: coming at this from the WQ prospective, how do we incorporate differential impacts and that certain activities aren’t being done because of water quality.

*James*: climate resiliency WG has come up with an options paper and the options are highly quantifiable. Some are also very qualitative. One recommendation is optimizing BMP selection and choosing the right ones so that they are more resilient in climate change. When you take a look at that WGs set of recommendations because it does run the full gambit. The more qualitative would be including something in your programmatic milestones and how they’re adapting to climate change to reach a goal or open ended.

*Rich*: it’s not just the CB, it’s local.

*Patrick*: PA is doing work trying to understand climate resiliency. Part of me looks at the scarce resources, how much does this change outcome and where we decide to spend the next dollar. The talk of Conowingo and the Dissolved Oxygen in the trench, how does that translate to the WQ stance? Is it big or little?

*James*: 3% non-attainment which is 3-4 million pounds nitrogen. 400—500 pounds for phosphorus for Conowingo.

*Patrick*: how much of this change is locational? We’re making decisions now where we spend the money are we going to be surprised later?

*Rich*: climate change is bigger than Conowingo.

*Ann*: in PA, if we’re coming out with new load info, the more we can tie that to a financial figure so that there isn’t a lag in the load information and this other information it would be better.

*Gayle Barry, USDA*: the mapping of the legacy sediment soils, should we maybe look at those too and bring that data into the discussion of the release of these sediments? The concept was that there were all these dams across the watershed that built up sediment behind them, there are barn fields that are covered with 10-20ft of sediment before you get down to the muk soil.

*Molly*: these decisions will be made in December and start getting a better understanding of the numbers. In May we’ll nail down the decisions to move forward with the phase 3 WIPs.

*Patrick*: when talking about the local area goals, there’s the differences in municipalities. These are conversations that will have to happen on our end at multiple levels, legislation, counties, Burroughs, etc. It may be effective in terms of the conversation at the municipal level but we need to be able to explain it at every scale.

**Environmental Finance Symposium – MB Charge to Action Team – Jim Edward**

Seeking concurrence on the path forward

Want input on; Do we focus on core recommendations only or the theme recommendations?

Within the current Budget and Finance WG, there aren’t enough financing expertise. MB recommendation was to create a temporary action team that would report to the MB on the path forward.

Charge put together for the Action Team which walks through the background of the action team and edits were made to the charge after MB input.

The action team would present a draft plan for the recommendations at the March MB meeting and at the May PSC meeting.

*Patrick*: just an overall observation, part of me wants to know immediately some of the charge items (particularly #2) before heading down implementation recommendations. The other piece, I think at the micro level the involvement with the team, some of the concern is the additive aspect of this at what point as a PSC do we take that step back? Don’t want a report 9 months from now and want to be able to talk about it at this level to make sure we’re on the right path.

*Shawn*: brought this up previously where we discussed all the things in motion. How deep should we go into some of these things vs the Program office as the lead. We need to set our own roles in this.

*Patrick*: I see the WG’s and Actions Teams work as more tactical. MB and PSC focuses on the policy

*Ann*: from a strategic point of view where the PSC should be leading, we went through an interesting exercise going through the summary and had an eye for what our members could translate at the General Assembly or US Congressional level. The conversation was valuable. For this action team to be productive, it would be good to have the conversation at the PSC level and focus on a few of the priorities. Ask the question, what would be the biggest contribution the bay program could make to these finance issues?

*Ben*: Need to zero in on priorities like public-private partnerships and others then really have the action team drill down further on it. Need that coordinated approach and there’s an urgency.

*Nick*: which of these recommendations should the Bay Program focus on and what the jurisdictions should focus on? Then we can give that info to the Action Team.

*Jim*: the issue is whether we can effectively do that today, then perhaps we ask PSC members to get back to us within 2 weeks with a response.

*Molly*: we’ll put this on the December agenda and at the same time get the action team filled out. Will allow time on the agenda for discussion and people to bring back their ideas.

**Action: Topic will be presented to the PSC at the December meeting with an in-depth discussion of the recommendations. PSC members should be prepared to present who will represent their jurisdiction or agency on the Action Team during the discussion. In addition, the PSC agreed that a survey/doodle poll will be sent out to the membership within the next week for an opportunity to provide comments on the recommendations. The PSC will have 2 weeks to submit feedback.**

*Patrick*: should also recognize the timing issue, when we get to December there will be some things that fall off the table.

*Ann*: Also, the instructions that go out for this exercise need to be important to clarify what the Bay Program does vs each jurisdiction.

**Biennial Programmatic Review – Dave Goshorn**

Overview of the process and timeline for implementing the CBP’s adaptive management system and how the PSC will check in on progress.

Thematic timing/ grouping of the Quarterly GIT Progress Session and the general structure of a two-year period of review included in the timeline.

*Ann*: GIT 6 has done a good job thinking this through and how the MB can be proactive at looking at implementation and raising the important policy issues to the PSC.

**Program Update**

*Nick*: The Watershed Forum was held in September which had a presentation the last day about the York County storm calculator tool. The tool allows you to bring up parcel data, identify the area you want to put a BMP on, calculate the acres of pervious and impervious surfaces. Its tied to the BMP efficiencies of the partnership. Have asked for it to be part of the MB meeting in November. If the PSC is interested, this is a good informational presentation to get the tool acknowledged.

*Shawn*: would love to see the presentation but it sounds like the December meeting is full. Could we do a webinar and then pass it along?

*Nick*: will talk to the conservancy to see if we can set up a webinar

*Gayle*: this would allow us to share with our technical staff as well.

**Concluding Remarks**

*Patrick*: want to recognize the fact that EPA, USDA, and the other state partners were supportive at the EC meeting to make sure we’re working through to address our issues. The tone of the meeting and the cooperatively supportive message from all the jurisdictions was very helpful.