

### **ACTIONS & DECISIONS**

- **DONE - Bryant will circle back with Jeremy by the end of the day about what upper management says**
  - **We will share the results of this discussion with the WQGIT and other participants in this process for concurrence (NOT consensus)**
  - **If you feel you've been corralled or there is a surprise about what has been listed as the revised line up (Option B-2), please reach out to Kristin and Jeremy so we can discuss. The goal is to not have any surprises for the Management Board**
  - **Options for Management Board, as defined at the end of the discussion**
    - **Option A: Original top six tributaries recommended as the result of the exercises GIT representatives took part in**
      - **Potomac**
      - **Choptank**
      - **Rappahannock**
      - **York**
      - **Patuxent**
      - **Chester**
    - **Option B (Referred to in the meeting as "B-2"): The WQGIT and other GIT representatives recommend the following tributaries for development:**
      - **For In house Development by the CBPO Modeling Team:**
        - **Potomac**
        - **James**
        - **York**
      - **For inclusion in an RFA:**
        - **Choptank**
        - **Patapsco**
        - **Rappahannock**
      - **Request for funding for one or two additional tributary teams, of which the following three options were suggested (Note - \$250,000 covers one tributary team to develop the model, engage with stakeholders, and apply the model over the course of five years. Approximately \$50,000 per year, per team)**
        - **Patuxent**
        - **Chester**
        - **Pocomoke**
- **Setting up Context:**
- **Jeremy: Reinforcing the positive**
    - **Other GITs are happy they were included, and we could not have completed the exercises without their expertise**
    - **We appear to have strong agreement on the Potomac, York, and Choptank**
    - **Patuxent, Rappahannock, and Chester are in flux**

- Jeremy: Ground Rules
  - We are not dependent on strict consensus today
  - We want to move forward with a reasonable number of options, so we need to have a decisive and constructive mindset
  - In the one hour set aside for today, we are going to ask for targeted input from the people who had questions at the previous before we ask for others. Please be mindful of longer comments
    - We don't have time to discuss the timeline today
- Question 1: Does anyone feel strongly about the James?
  - Bryant: Yes, we do feel strongly, but need to make some qualifications first:
    - James should be represented in as much as there was an 8 year process to develop Chlorophyll a criteria and we want to make sure this is recognized going forward. We think in order to make this consistent, it needs to be an MTM.
      - While the MBM will be sufficient for DO, we think we need a higher resolution grid to account for the need to address Chlorophyll a
      - Lew: the James is unique in that it has seen the most rigorous Chlorophyll a assessment and it can be used to apply to other parts of the Chesapeake Bay, should there be interest in it from managers
    - Jeremy: should the James be done in house or by RFA?
      - Bryant: it makes sense to be done in house, since there is already a connection to the chlorophyll a criteria team. That would be best for the iterative process needed
    - Jeremy: which tributary should the James replace?
      - Bryant: we need to hear what the input of the other jurisdictions are first
  - Ed Dunne: I remember from Lew's presentation in August that the GIT would confirm the James, York, and Potomac would be in house. This seems to be building on what was discussed before. This also seems to facilitate utilizing local datasets and iteration with the in house teams. From a DC/Potomac perspective, this is a good path forward
  - KC Filippino: would this build on previous James work or just a new model being developed?
    - Lew: it would build on the chlorophyll a assessment
  - Kristin: For Dave and Lew, are you capable through the Modeling Workgroup to engage with the partners and jurisdictions?
    - Lew: yes, that is built into the RFA and the in house process. We are building the models to support management and decision makers. We also want to support other environmental modeling when we can
    - KC: Regarding Kristin's question, will engagement and review happen outside of the Modeling WG too or only within the MWG?
      - This question was not answered
  - Kristin: for the other participants who did the exercise, what are their thoughts?
    - George: the ranking process was very robust, we had contribution from many different representatives and the results averaged our inputs to give us a picture of input across the partnership

- Bruce: would the James include its sub tributaries such as Chickahominy and Elizabeth?
  - Jeremy: yes, it will
  - Bruce: For the James overall, the Elizabeth (Lafayette) is an oyster restoration tributary, is impacted by invasive blue catfish, has sturgeon and striped bass spawning and significant commerce that may be different from other tributaries selected.
- Tish Robertson: I filled out the survey for Virginia. I found it to be confusing, to be honest. In my tab of the decision matrix, the James River, the York R. and the Potomac Rivers were already filled out. So I did not rank those tributaries. I am concerned that because of this, the James was ranked lower than it should have been.
- Question 2: What's the latest perspective from MD about Patapsco?
  - Dinorah: we want the Patapsco, it's one of our top priorities. MD's goal was to have all Patapsco waters swimmable by 2020, so while we did not meet that goal, we want to put more emphasis on it.
    - Dinorah: It would replace the Patuxent, if we have to choose. If we can find more funding, would be great to still include that
  - George: Just want to defend the process we took here. It is better than just listing preferences right now
    - Cheyenne: yes, I second George
    - Dinorah and Bryant: we felt we did not have enough time and the process was incomplete
      - KC: Agree, process wasn't clear and my answers were incomplete. I think the information could be provided by experts, and a ranking would reveal itself. Many of these questions had quantitative answers.
      - Tish: I only ranked tributaries in VA because that's where my expertise is. I did not rank DC or MD waters (except for the Pocomoke, which we share). So like KC my answers were incomplete. But I also think that's fair to leave things to the experts.
        - Dinorah: We did the same Tish. Only ranked the tributaries in MD.
- Question 3: What's the latest from MD regarding Lower Eastern Shore?
  - Bruce: I think Choptank is key and would not replace. I do think from a habitat and fish perspective Pocomoke would be good add.
  - Dinorah: Choptank is also good, I think Wicomico or Pocomoke would be good for a poultry heavy watershed
- Scoping Options: Options for the Management Board
  - KC: If the York is done, why is it included?
    - Jeremy: just needs the finishing touches
    - Lew: there is a little bit more work to do, such as including more resolution in the Mobjack Bay and updating the water quality code. There is already a grid in SCHISM
  - Renee: The process was imperfect and challenging at times since we only have expertise relating to some of the criteria. However, some of the criteria was objective, like when

we used GIS data for Protected Lands and Impervious Surfaces. Maybe we can do more objective analyses instead of relying on eyeballing the numbers

- Dinorah: How do others feel about changing the Chester for the Pocomoke or Wicomico?
- Bryant: Here is my suggested line up: Patapsco, Rappahannock and Choptank for RFA. York, Potomac and James in-house.
- Kristin: lets compare the James with the Rappahannock – what are the tradeoffs of switching one off for the other
  - Lew: James has slightly more estuarine expression than Rappahannock. James has uniqueness with respect to chlorophyll.
  - Tish: Rappahannock has all of the designated uses. Rappahannock is a good place for understanding shallow water dynamics
  - Bruce: Rappahannock is undergoing rapid land use change; development ( I think), maybe Renee can weigh in.
- Dinorah: if the only option is to replace the Chester with the James, we would agree with that, if others agree. With the Anacostia being included in the Potomac, I feel comfortable offering the Chester. Let's hope we can add one more and we could either bring back the Chester, or add the Pocomoke, so we will have another Eastern Shore tributary in the list.
  - Bruce: The Fish GIT agrees with idea to focus on Lower Eastern Shore
- Dinorah: MD would consider providing funds for the 7th or 8th tributary
- Bryant: need to double check with upper management, but would recommend we try to provide one recommendation for simplicity's sake.
  - Lew and Dave: agreed
  - Jeremy: that sounds good, but we need to make sure the other GIT perspectives are represented in what we present to the Management Board
- Options for Management Board, as defined at the end of the discussion
  - Option A: Original top six tributaries recommended as the result of the exercises GIT representatives took part in
    - Potomac
    - Choptank
    - Rappahannock
    - York
    - Patuxent
    - Chester
  - Option B (Referred to in the meeting as "B-2"): The WQGIT and other GIT representatives recommend the following tributaries for development:
    - For In house Development by the CBPO Modeling Team:
      - Potomac
      - James
      - York
    - For inclusion in an RFA:
      - Choptank
      - Patapsco

- Rappahannock
- Request for funding for one or two additional tributary teams, of which the following three options were suggested (Note - \$250,000 covers one tributary team to develop the model, engage with stakeholders, and apply the model over the course of five years. Approximately \$50,000 per year, per team)
  - Patuxent
  - Chester
  - Pocomoke

**Participants:** Alex Gunnerson, Bruce Vogt, Bryant Thomas, Cheyenne Owens, Dave Montali, Dinorah Dalmasy, Doug Austin, Ed Dunne, George Onyullo, Guido Yactayo, Hilary Swartwood, Jackie Pickford, Jeremy Hanson, KC Filippino, Kevin McLean, Kristin Saunders, Lee McDonnell, Lew Linker, Renee Thompson, Suzanne Trevena, Tish Robertson.