

WQGIT Decision Vote Tracker - 06/23/2025

To what extent do you agree with the following: Decision to use Option B (New Shoreline Version) of the Land-River Segments in Phase 7 CAST?

Consensus Continuum							
The graphic shows five colored buttons with icons and text: <ul style="list-style-type: none">1 (Red): I do not agree and don't see how it could be changing at this time.2 (Green): I believe some have concerns but would be willing to discuss.3 (Purple): I stand aside and will not vote. I believe some have concerns but would be willing to discuss.4 (Blue): I agree with the decision.5 (Orange): I prefer.							
Role	Name	Affiliation	Email vote post-meeting	Notes	Vote in 6.23 meeting	Notes	
Signatory	Holly Walker	DNREC	4	I confirm Delaware's position of Agree with Reservations	4	Also agree with Cassie's points.	
	George Onyullo	DOEE	4		4		
	Greg Sandi	MDE	4		4		
	Cassie Davis	NYSDEC		[For members present in June who did not reach out with revised or corrected votes, we default to their June 23 vote]	4	No preference between A or B. Just don't want to have a minimum threshold and have to modify the boundaries. If we put a minimum on it, gonna be a Agree with Cassie's points.	
	Scott Heidel	PA DEP	4	Confirming that PA remains a 4, in support of Option B, Land River Segmentation and shares the concern with NY on minimum sizes.	4		
	Kevin Mclean	VA DEQ		[For members present in June who did not reach out with revised or corrected votes, we default to their June 23 vote]	3	Strong preference for B, although would also prefer to pursue an "Option C" with a minimum segment size.	
	Scott Settle	WV	5		5		
	Marel King	CBC		[For members present in June who did not reach out with revised or corrected votes, we default to their June 23 vote]	4		
	Bo Williams	EPA	5		5	Prefer B but not comfortable with the increase in # of segments and # of segments below 1000 acres.	
	At-Large				I remain a 4 and my comments still stand. I also wonder if there can be discussion of an option that allows states to be flexible, especially if they have known slivers with BMPs that can be easily adjusted with boundaries that make sense. We may not need a minimum threshold but rather guidelines to allow for states to customize so that the BMPs are reported in the right segments.		4
KC Filippino		HRPDC	4				
Joe Wood		CBF	4				
Emily Dekar		USC		[For members present in June who did not reach out with revised or corrected votes, we default to their June 23 vote]	4		No specific preference between A or B. But agree with Cassie on no minimum thresholds. Would change to probably a 3 if there was minimum set.
Kevin Du Bois		DoD	3				
Tom Howard		Resolve Hydro		[For members with no alternate, a missing vote will be considered the same as a "stand aside."]			
Mike La Sala		LandStudies		[For members present in June who did not reach out with revised or corrected votes, we default to their June 23 vote]	4		