

# **Meeting Summary**

#### In Attendance

- Katheryn Barnhart (EPA)
- Keith Bollt (EPA)
- Katie Brownson (USFS)
- Sarah Brzezinski (EPA)
- Lorenzo Cinalli (USFS)
- Jeremy Cox (Bay Journal)
- Dinorah Dalmasy (MDE)
- Mariah Davis (CCWC)
- Rachel Felver (ACB)
- Chris Guy (USFWS)
- Annabelle Harvey (CBF)

- Mark Hoffman (CBC)
- Sarah Lane (MD DNR)
- Julie Lawson (SAC)
- Jeff Lerner (EPA)
- David Maginnes (Freelance Journalist)
- Kevin McLean (VA DEQ)
- Dave Montali (Tetra Tech/WV)
- Alisha Mulkey (MDA)
- Kristin Saunders (UMCES)
- Bo Williams (EPA)

### Action Items & Decisions

- Comments that are editorial in nature, and that don't significantly change the structure or content of the report, will be made by the Drafting Team.
- The Drafting Team will prioritize getting the comments out to SMEs to provide as much time for review as possible.
  - o Rachel Felver will send comments to SMEs. (Done)
- Comments directly related to the charge of the Beyond 2025 Steering Committee will be compiled and sent to the Beyond 2025 Steering Committee.
- The Reaching 2025 Team decided to solicit volunteers from its membership to help review and respond to larger, substantive comments during a meeting next week. (Done)
- The following individuals will join members of the Drafting Team in a meeting next week to review and respond to larger, substantive comments received in response to the draft report:
  - Julie Lawson
  - Chris Guy
  - Mariah Davis
  - Katie Brownson
  - o Dave Montali
  - Kristin Saunders
  - Bo Williams
- Sarah Brzezinski will send out a scheduler for a meeting next week. (Done)
- General agreement was reached that we will prioritize the comments that pertain to the first portion of the report (recommendations) in advance of the MB.



• Kristin Saunders volunteered to look at all the comments that were received to help the Drafting Team identify "red flag" issues that she recommended should be worked out with stakeholder groups before the recommendations are advanced to the MB.

#### Welcome and Agenda Review

- Jeff Lerner welcomed participants to the meeting and reviewed the agenda. This meeting was convened to:
  - Provide feedback on a proposed process for addressing feedback from Management
     Board members and the public during the 30-day comment period.
  - Provide direction on how to address certain comments that do not easily fit into the proposed process for response.

### Overview of Comments Received

- Rachel Felver provided an overview of how many comments were received and the breakdown of respondents.
  - She noted that 384 comments were received from 19 individuals/organizations.

#### Discuss Process for Comment Review and Response

- Keith Bolt and Rachel shared a spreadsheet of comments and reviewed the structure and contents of the document.
  - All comments have been captured in a tracking spreadsheet that includes the name/organization of the person that submitted them, the section of the report that they apply to and the suggested response.
    - When completed, this tracking spreadsheet will likely be uploaded on bay.net and shared with the public.
  - Chris Guy commented that he likes the way the document was compiled, while noting that many people have different preferences for splitting out and lumping together comments and responses.
  - Keith and Rachel reviewed how comments are being categorized into four "types," for the purposes of response. These "types" are described below, along with the Drafting Team's proposals for how to respond. The Reaching 2025 Team was asked to provide feedback on a proposed process for responding to comments. Discussion topics are summarized below, too.
    - Editorial: Comments that are editorial in nature, and that don't significantly change the structure or content of the report, will be made by the Drafting Team.
      - No objections were received to this approach to responding to editorial comments.



- 2. Subject Matter Experts: Comments that specifically are aimed toward a section of the report in which Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) were engaged in the initial drafting will be sent to those SMEs, who will be asked to address the comments and recommend whether they should be accepted or declined.
  - If SMEs chose to decline, the Drafting Team will ask them to provide a justification in the comment tracking spreadsheet.
  - This includes specific comments made to the Outcome Attainability Templates.
  - Chris asked if someone going to identify which SME needs to respond to each comment.
    - Keith responded that for subject-specific topics, we will plan to review the membership of the larger Reaching 2025 Team and Subject Matter Experts who were engaged in the original drafting of the document to engage experts, as appropriate.
  - Chris commented that as we are "binning" comments, we should consider identifying a lead SME for the response, so that we don't end up with four sets of contradictory comments.
    - Katie mentioned that she would want to provide feedback on comments that are relevant to her sections of the document.
    - Rachel commented that we are still adding comments from Choose Clean Water Coalition into the document. A next step will be to group comments by which SME needs to be engaged in responding to each, and connecting similar comments to prevent SMEs from having to respond to each line item.
    - ACTION: The Drafting Team will prioritize getting the comments out to SMEs to provide as much time for review as possible.
  - No objections were received to this approach to responding to comments.
- 3. Beyond 2025: Comments directly related to the charge of the Beyond 2025 Steering Committee will be compiled and sent to them.
  - A team member agreed, commenting that we should lump such comments together, forward them to the Beyond 2025 Steering Committee and move on.
  - No objections were received to this approach to responding to comments.
- 4. Larger, substantive comments: Comments that are in reference to the entire report, are more general or call for a significant rehauling and restructuring of the report.
  - For larger, substantive comments, Keith and Rachel proposed two options for the team's input. Either:



- The Drafting Team will solicit volunteers from the broader Reaching 2025 Team who are willing to join a meeting to address these comments or
- The small Drafting Team will work to address the comments to the best of their ability.
- Rachel asked if it the will of the Reaching 2025 Team that the Drafting
  Team take our best crack at responding to larger, substantive comments
  or if there are members of this team that would be willing to meet next
  week to discuss and address the comments.
- The Reaching 2025 Team decided to solicit volunteers from its membership to help review and respond to larger, substantive comments during a meeting next week. The following individuals volunteered to join members of the Drafting Team:
  - Julie Lawson
  - Chris Guy
  - Mariah Davis
  - Katie Brownson
  - Dave Montali
  - Kristin Saunders
  - o Bo Williams
- Sarah Brzezinski will send out a scheduler for a meeting next week.
- In a perfect world, we wanted to have an updated report to share with the MB on September 5<sup>th</sup>. The number of comments received and the tight timeline established by processes required for approval make this unlikely.
- Do we focus our time on high-level recommendations? What work should we prioritize in advance of the PSC meeting? The drafting team wants feedback from the Reaching 2025 Team on these questions.
  - Chris Guy commented that we can't bypass the Management Board. We have to have something for their meeting on September 5<sup>th</sup>
  - Jeff responded that the first 20 pages or so of the report are focused on recommendations. Ha asked the team if we should focus our attention here in advance of the MB meeting, then catch up on the detailed Outcome Attainability comments.
    - Julie commented that the Stakeholders Advisory Committee would likely support a more detailed review of comments, as opposed to a quick review to meet the deadlines. She noted that on a personal level, she thought that Jeff's approach makes sense.
  - At a bare minimum, we must have the recommendations completed by September 5, commented Chris Guy. We can do a detailed review for the Outcome Attainability sections in advance of the PSC.



- General agreement was reached that we will prioritize the comments that pertain to the first portion of the report (recommendations) in advance of the MB.
  - No one disagreed with this comment, but one member commented that she is skeptical that the team will be able to accomplish even this by September 5<sup>th</sup>.
  - Chris commented that some of the comments received were submitted by
     Reaching 2025 Team members, which may expedite our ability to address them
- Mariah asked if the Drafting Team has considered ranking the comments by:
  - O Tier 1: We can do these things in the next year
  - Tier 2: Things that we can address in the next few years
  - Tier 3: Things that are important, but we won't be able to address immediately;
     comments that are more appropriate to be addressed by the Beyond 2025 Steering
     Committee
- Jeff commented that a triage of comments might be helpful as we engage volunteers from the Reaching 2025 committee in addressing comments.
- Katie Brownson commented that, looking at the EC Charge, it appears narrower than the draft report that was produced. She noted that the MB wants the CliffsNotes version of the report; they want something like a 2-page glossy that they can share with their PSC members.
  - This team member recommended that we make sure that there are not any "showstoppers" in the comments for the higher-level recommendations.
  - She recommended that we respond to comments and clean up the recommendations of the report in advance of the MB meeting.
  - Dave Montali commented that we should look at the barebones of the EC Charge and prioritize accordingly.
  - Keith Bollt commented that he feels that we still owe a response to individuals who submitted comments
- Rachel summarized that the most important piece, based on the charge, is the recommendations associated with the report.
- The team agreed that the recommendations should be prioritized.
- In advance of the MB meeting, the Drafting Team will extract the comments out and send them to the SMEs. The Drafting Team would like to hear from SMEs:
  - Are there some comments you can address before the MB, and if so, what is the response?
  - Are there other comments that you need more time to address, but can complete before the PSC?
- Kristin Saunders noted that if we send comments out to SMEs as proposed, it might be helpful
  to give SMEs a small set of questions or guidance to look at as they consider the comments and
  provide feedback.
  - Look for "red flags so we can work issues out with stakeholder groups before the recommendations come out.
  - o Is there anything that runs contrary to the substance of the report?



- Kristin volunteered to look at all the comments to help the Drafting Team identify these issues.
- Closing out the meeting, Rachel summarized that
  - The recommendations in the report will be prioritized over everything else, because the Reaching 2025 Team agreed that this is what needs to be approved.
  - This team continue moving forward with reviewing comments and revising the draft report, too, but such revisions will be prioritized below those associated with recommendations.
  - The Team can seek to create awareness among MB about what the key topics we will continue to address after its September 5<sup>th</sup> meeting.