Beyond 2025 Steering Committee – Small Group Symposium
February 28-29ᵗʰ
Meeting Minutes

-----Action items are **bolded** throughout the document and compiled at the end -----

<u>**Day 1, February 28**</u>

<u>**Welcome and Symposium Overview**</u>

- Introduction and welcome from Martha Shimkin, CBPO director
- Introduction from Drew Dehoff, SRBC director
- Introduction (Recorded) from MD Governor Wes Moore

<u>**Session 1- CBP Organizational History**</u>

Ann Swanson (CBC retired) and Diana Esher (EPA)

- Introduction and background from Ann
- Bay program started under difficult political conditions and has survived many years
- The Chesapeake Bay is an ecosystem, not just a pollutant load
- Ecosystem, people, economy are intertwined
- Six categories of protecting and restoring the Bay and its watershed
    - Vision/passion
    - Leadership
    - Culture, consensus, partnership
    - Structure
    - Policy framework/agreement
    - Timelines
- Martha Shimkin: clarifying question about "if you're in, you're not down"
- Kristin Reilly, Choose Clean Water: Question about the power dynamic, the message to pull people in should be top-down too to get folks engaged in the process
- Ann Swanson: Agreed with Kristin, there is a role in informing from the top down
- Jess Blackburn: Can you give an example of bringing the partnership together?
    - Diana Esher: Water quality standards
        - Used the science
        - EPA met with every state every month individually
        - The partnership met quarterly
        - She brought a positive attitude and kept it light and encouraging as the chair of the process
        - The meeting ended short of the goals, but EPA and Delaware took a piece of the remaining effort needed, and everyone pitched in
    - Ann Swanson: "tenacity"
- Diana: What is the effect of blurring of the lines between stakeholders, partners, politicians in the Bay Program?
    - CBP is unique in this blurring
- Jill Whitcomb: The words resonate with PA's work: being the catalyst for action, amplifying stakeholder groups. Thank you for the message

- o   Diana: Change the language about PA, it's a lot of work but it's the biggest opportunity
  - o   Ann: PA has momentum and everyone should be pitching in
- Kevin Du Bois: Developing a sense of urgency, it's needed. Climate for example. Bearing down in the short term is important because we're making our job harder working forward. Putting together projects that have multiple benefits is good. In DOD there is a lot of movement behind carbon sequestration. How can we meet other goals too? There is not enough money if we don't do projects that don't meet multiple objectives. There were 14 projects because of the policy movement towards carbon sequestration
- Carin Bisland: This is not a pass-fail program, if we miss a timeline, we didn't fail
- Jake Reilly: The origin of the partnership was around water quality, and the growth of the partnership has been growing beyond that.
  - o   Ann Swanson: The origin was not water quality, it was over living resources (crabs doing poorly and Senator Mathias noticing and sponsoring a research program)
- Jess Blackburn: Driving decisions beyond structure changes?
  - o   Diana: 2008 reorganization of structure: Mostly showmanship of leadership, didn't make a difference in how successful the program was,
  - o   Ann: It just created mayhem
  - o   Diana: It's not about creating boxes, it's about bringing folks together across organizations to solve the problem. However, integrating something like climate change or sunsetting work that is complete is a productive structural chrange
  - o   Ann: The Bay Program is like a Rubix Cube, different people lead at different times
- Matt Rowe: Adaptive management, it's supposed to be built into the TMDL, the partnership, are we using it well?
  - o   Diana: It's worked well, it lets the program be mindful of change
  - o   Ann: There is a disconnect between adaptive management for scientists and adaptive management for policy leaders. Adaptive management is not the same thing as flexibility in policy. The Bay program collects data really well, and it helps back up changes in course (or staying the course) at the legislative level

Session 2: Small Group Recommendations, People Group

Julia Wakeling, DC DOEE and Julie Lawson, Stakeholders' Advisory Committee

PRESENTATION

- Overview of the process for developing the recommendations
  - o   Timeline
  - o   Defining People
  - o   Case study in putting human and ecosystem health on the same level: Puget Sound
- Overview of the 5 recommendations from the People Small Group
  - o   Governance and accountability
    - ▪   Hire an independent expert (outside consultant) to reimagine the governance and accountability of the program

- DEIJ
  - Institute and activate the DEIJ Implementation Plan
  - Make DEIJ the core of all CBP activities
- Representative outcomes and goals
  - The goals and outcomes should reflect the needs of the individuals who live in the watershed, and be people first
- Networks and capacity building
  - Partnership should be a capacity builder of partners and networks (as well as a convenor)
- Social Science
  - Create a budget and staffing plan to fund and implement social sciences in the Partnership
- Vision: DEIJ as the framework through which the partnership operates
- Value: Distributed power structure, DEIJ leadership, and representative outcomes of communities
- Vanguard: A partnership that empowers communities

DISCUSSION

- Wendy O'Sullivan: People are the key indicator species should be the "vanguard"
- Diana Esher: Question on DEIJ and environmental justice. Should the partnership network with outside groups or build it internally in agencies?
  - Julie: EPA for example has an EJ office, how can this and other similar offices already in the partnership help our work?
  - Julia Wakeling: Yes to both outside and internal capacity building
  - Diana: There is money at EPA to build EJ capacity
- Chuck Herrick: Understand others before asking them to understand you. Building networks is the way to do that. What does the participatory budget process look like?
  - Kacey Wetzel: A training exists for both budgeting and grant making. You involve people impacted from the very beginning, the distribution of money, the criteria, and the decision making process. There are rules in federal funding, but there are ways to better distribute funding in an equitable way
  - Jill Whitcomb: Countywide block grant program is an example of participatory budgeting: EPA-> PADEP -> PA counties who pick->individual projects. There are constraints when different dollars are mixed with different rules. For example, Build America Buy America (federal) and PA state prevailing wage rules sometimes conflict when mixing state and federal monies in PA
  - Ann Swanson: There was a participatory budget process in the Chesapeake Bay Program 15 years ago. EPA had some core administrative functions (staff, following outside EPA rules) but most money was set aside. Afterwards, the signatories worked together to divide up EPA funds. The base was staffing and monitoring. We just need to go back and look how we did it 15 years ago. Also, people aren't living resources, they are the decision makers

- Larry Sanford: This is a radical reimagination, to put people at the center. Unlike any other environmental program. Is that an accurate framing of the proposal?
  - Yes from Julia Wakeling.
  - Mariah Davis: This is not a radical idea. These ideas of people-centric work already exist on other shops inside the partners
  - Larry: To put people as the final goal is a radical reimagination
  - Kristin Reilly: Reframing the work as people as an indicator species and as a resource
  - Diana Esher: People are a lot more tolerant than crabs
  - Brittany Hall: Different groups of people are affected differently
  - Diana Esher: That is participatory decision-making, which is different
  - Brittany Hall: Before putting people first, we can't achieve our other goals
- Chris Guy: "The" living resource is not in FWS's mission. Endangered species, other living resources are important too
  - Julie Wakeling: It is an indicator, not the indicator
  - Chris Guy: It is important to not lose sight of the habitat and living resources too

Session 2: Small Group Recommendations, Climate Group

Breck Sullivan, USGS; Bo Williams, EPA

PRESENTATION

- What is the problem? Hotter environment is changing the extent of suitable habitat for certain living resources, increasing precipitation (leading to increased nutrient and sediment pollutant loads to the Bay among other issues), and leading to rising sea levels (marsh migration and transformation of coastal habitats among other issues)
- Rec 1: Develop and implement framework for a climate-adaptive Bay and watershed of the future
  - Confront climate change and prioritize adaptation
  - Need to change 2014 Watershed Agreement vision statement to include climate
  - CBP needs to align CB Agreement goals with climate change
  - Establish *new* numeric goal for climate adaptation
  - CBP should adapt structure and increase capacity to integrate climate science into programs and decision making
  - Invest in climate adaptation initiatives
  - Apply structured decision making (SDM) at all levels to help account for uncertainty
- Rec 2: Improve resilience of communities to key regional climate vulnerabilities
  - Most vulnerable communities must be prioritized by supporting community-driven strategies, planning, investment
  - Build community adaptive capacity
  - Improve local involvement and engagement
- Rec 3: Promote carbon stewardship as a holistic approach to climate mitigation
  - Advance understanding of carbon stewardship science

- o Consider carbon in land use planning and decision making – incentivize protection of land that can serve as a carbon sink
  - o Improve regional coordination around carbon stewardship
- Rec 4: Promote strategies for healthy and productive ecosystems under a changing climate
  - o Support biodiversity, habitats, ecosystem services, and wellbeing of people
  - o Additional research to estimate future conditions under different scenarios
  - o Development and application of indicators for better tracking of ecosystem health status/change - allows us to provide better adaptive management
  - o Focus on nature-based solutions
  - o Support social science, communications strategies, and venues for discussion
- Rec 5: Promote regenerative agriculture production and regionally based food systems in the CB watershed
  - o Transform ag production by shifting to regenerative ag.
  - o Develop a CBP soil health outcome and add it to the 2014 Watershed Agreement
  - o Transform food systems to regionally based food systems
  - o Do all of this by expanding collaboration with other entities with common goals, support scientific advances in accounting for ag carbon/soil health and impacts of BMPs on soil health, ID strategies in CBP framework to incentivize policies and practices, evaluate how CBP structure can be changed to support this systemic change

DISCUSSION

- Kevin Du Bois: reached out to Breck about carbon sequestration being part of Navy's climate adaptation plan; Navy has been leader to determine what we're doing with carbon sequestration; conducted lit review of BMPs and what they mean for carbon sequestration;
  - o **VOLUNTARY ACTION: Kevin Du Bois plans to distribute a literature review article on carbon sequestration.**
- Kevin Du Bois: Arguably the biggest "crop" is residential lawn grass, so can you expand your efforts to understand ag soil health to *overall* soil health to bring in the people, too (reduce use of fertilizer, reduce watering, etc.)?
  - o Bo: Yes, agrees with and supports this
- Kristin Reilly: I liked how the climate small group started off centering people. Can you be more specific about non-climate stressors? What isn't a non-climate stressor at this point?
  - o Bo: overlapping vulnerabilities, certain communities are more vulnerable to stressors, talking about other stressors in the community like low income, public health challenges; overlapping stressors that make people more vulnerable
  - o *Discussion among the group about whether or not development is considered a climate stressor*
- Martha Shimkin: Had you considered possibility of making climate the overarching lens of the entire agreement rather than adding/creating specific goals?
  - o Bo: there was discussion, and they see both as valuable; started with lens concept and then looked at adding/creating specific goals

- Peter Tango: To recommendation #5, he likes the rec, but 1) it sounds very terrestrial-oriented (aquaculture is involved too, right?) and 2) the way in which people are able to access their protein resources are impacted by toxic contaminants
  - Bo and Breck: 1) In supporting information, this is something that they considered but didn't fit it in, and 2) incorporating toxic contaminants is important in guiding how we move forward – a good point.
- Jess Blackburn: 1) You mentioned SDM, can you explain what that means and how it might be applied to other recs; 2) who do you mean by "communities" when you talk about community adaptation?
  - Bo: SDM is way to make decisions given conditions of uncertainty
  - Kathy Boomer: Agreed with Bo. SDM is a logic framework that can be used throughout CBP work to inform how we frame decisions and science needed to support the decision, who the decision impacts, guides what additional research we might need to address these questions
  - Bo: on question 2, the word community includes local governments. Local governments – and others - are implementing things on the ground to build adaptation and all are part of 'community'.
- Ben Alexandro (in chat): Has the group thought about permanent land conservation goals as a way to achieve the outcomes that have been laid out?
  - Katie Brownson: in strategies for carbon stewardship, they call out role of land conservation in preserving carbon sinks (including economic incentives)
  - Ruth Cassilly: modeled conservation scenarios to show what climate impacts could be under different climate scenarios
- Jake Reilly: Right now, there is lots of money being spent on climate, probably going to increase, but we are losing opportunities to coordinate those funds being put on the ground to achieve complimentary goals. It is imperative for the Bay Program to be serious about putting climate at the forefront because the money that is flowing can be used to achieve climate goals in addition to others (WQ, etc.) and vice versa.
- Jake Reilly: Recommendation #5 is an example of how the CBP can provide real benefits to communities and people
  - Bo Williams: agreed: EPA is putting lots of funding toward supporting communities in their adaptation efforts (Justice40 EJ grants)
  - Diana Esher: $27 billion in grant funding (nationwide) is for GHG reduction fund focused on EJ communities and must be awarded by end of the 2024 fiscal year

Session 2: Small Group Recommendations, Shallow Waters Group

Gina Hunt, MD DNR

PRESENTATION

- Scope = edges and nearshore waters of non-tidal, fresh tidal fresh, tidal estuarine

- o No definitive depths
- Vision = healthy and sustainable shallow water habitats that support resources, communities, and economies that are resilient to long-term changes in watershed conditions
- For process, defined vision and scope first, then started engaging with workgroups related to shallow habitats, held listening session (600 comments; organized those into 13 themes and then developed summaries)

- Rec 1 – Climate-resilient restoration
    - o [point not in slides] Water quality/nutrient pollution is just one stressor for healthy habitats, and addressing one stressor isn't going to make the difference we need
- Rec 2 – Integrated modeling and monitoring
- Rec 3 – Adaptation strategy to inform habitat management and project planning
- Rec 4 – Communication and engagement
- Rec 5 – Effective governance, collaboration, and innovative funding

DISCUSSION

- Dave Montali: When people hear 'shallow water', they may think of the bay itself and not the rest of the watershed (i.e., streams). Dave expressed concern that the use of that term isn't going to resonate with the people further up in the watershed – perhaps the recommendation should explicitly include streams in the watershed?
    - o Gina Hunt: the group felt that other parts of the watershed *were* captured in the term in the recommendation - the input is appreciated.
- Bryant Thomas: what does 'accountability' look like in this context? Did the group talk about this?
    - o Chris Guy: the group did think about this
    - o Stefanie Taillon: this is the ultimate question that we'll all wrestle with. With this rec, we're looking at accountability as being incentive-based rather than punitive; this should be a true partnership, which is based on trust and relationship-building.
- James Martin: on 5th recommendation, did you talk about how the SRS process can change to meet what you're calling for here?
    - o Gina: team didn't talk about it extensively; SRS process is good with checking in on the outcomes, telling us how we're doing in achieving our goal; if you go to some of the workgroups, the chair is leading the workgroup and the work is happening at that level, not necessarily coming from the members of the workgroup (there isn't always skin in the game for jurisdiction members in the groups... how do you bridge what they're doing in their state with what they're doing in the workgroup?) One of the strategies is a multi-outcome plan to incorporate WQ but isn't regulatory. Should be a data portal (that can be an accountability tool) that we can all use; SRS doesn't necessarily serve this need.
- Wendy O'Sullivan: Can you elaborate on your outreach strategy and how you're going to maintain these connections throughout this process?
    - o Jess: the group used announcements to their networks as primary mode of outreach

- o Gina: moving forward, full engagement is going to be difficult because contact information for everyone from the listening session doesn't exist, but the team can still go back to the workgroups, etc.
- Kathy Boomer: likes Dave's comment; an equally significant objective to keep in mind from CESR is recognizing that biogeochemical processes are happening in terrestrial estuarine transition zone not captured in current modeling framework, need to focus more on sub-estuaries of Bay system. Did this come up in your discussions?
  - o Gina: specificity of what we wanted to monitor/model for didn't come up, the 'how' and the 'what' wasn't something they addressed (not enough information available to make the connections); need to shift focus to areas where we're missing information
- Online Question: speak to a-ha moment from stakeholder meeting, related to "isn't water quality improvement enough?"
  - o Gina: WQ is not going to necessarily get us more living resources or healthy habitats (it helps but is not whole story). It is like a leaky boat with multiple holes, and dealing with WQ is like plugging one of the holes (climate is likely a bigger hole than TMDL), so we need to focus on the other holes
  - o Jill Whitcomb: to say that WQ is just one hole in a boat is missing the forest for the trees; practices that are put in place for WQ have co-benefits and we need to be open-minded remembering that it isn't just one or the other
    - ▪ Gina: To be clear: not saying that BMPs for WQ don't have habitat benefits. However, we are focused on the WQ BMPs and not those for living resources. We don't want them to 'just' be a co-benefit, maybe we could get more living resource benefits than benefits for, say, nitrogen, if we choose different BMPs. Maybe those are the BMPs that we should choose.
- Brittany Hall: rec #5, can we get more of an explanation of product over process?
  - o <u>Not</u> excluding people from the process; we need to have a program nimble enough to achieve our end goals, not one that gets bogged down in bureaucracy
  - o Chris Guy: in the past, have been so focused on the process, we've forgotten about the outcome; do not want to exclude anyone from the process

Session 2: Small Group Recommendations, Healthy Watersheds Group

Jeff Lerner, EPA

- Overview of the process that went into the recommendations
  - o Defining "healthy watershed": a watershed that supports the dynamic processes, habitats, and water quality conditions able to support healthy and climate-resilient and communities
- Putting forth a vanguard idea: A more holistic and people-centric approach to improving and maintaining watershed health as a foundational goal of the partnership
- 5 recommendations:
  - o Data, tools and monitoring: Use data, modelling, tools to track, characterize the Watershed and support implementation of the Watershed Agreement

- Including quantifying ecosystem services watershed wide, and then using them to make Partnership decisions
    - o Planning: Green infrastructure planning at different government scales throughout the watershed
    - o Community and partner engagement: Increase through capacity building
    - o Watershed actions: Integrate land conservation and stewardship more explicitly into the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement
    - o Accountability: Revise the Chesapeake Bay Program partnership's accountability framework to promote watershed health (count outcomes instead of practices)
- Dave Montali: Is there overlap between the different maps in the watershed?
    - o Jeff Lerner: Yes, depending on where you look
- James Martin and Keith Bollt: What does "outcome" mean in the Accountability framework proposal to track outcomes instead of practices? And at what cost (James)?
    - o Jeff Lerner: New outcomes may be needed to support healthy watersheds. Cost and timelines would need to be worked out.
    - o Martha Shimkin: Unsure at this time which specific outcomes would be new, enhanced, or untouched
- Bryant Thomas: Aligning with local priorities and taking care of local streams will help the Bay. Thinking of 303d list, for example. That's water quality focused but includes ecosystems for example. Is the Chessie BIBI updated?
    - o Jeff Lerner: Yes, Chessie BIBI is updated. How can we use information that already exists but outside of our existing network to inform implementation?
- Chuck Herrick: Hearing lots about the strategic decision process. Reducing uncertainty in making decisions
    - o Jeff Lerner agrees and points to ecosystem services maps as an example
- Wendy O'Sullivan: Thank you to the team and to Katie Brownson in particular
- Dave Montali: West Virginia has examples of integrated watershed management
- Jill Whitcomb: Doesn't say anything about building out a communications office. Can we expand the Bay Program Partnership's communications office in order to translate our recommendations and build the communications gap?

Session 2: Small Group Recommendations, Clean Water Group

Jill Whitcomb – PA DEP, Lee McDonnell – EPA, Joe Wood – CBF

PRESENTATION

- Clean water TEAM, not clean water small group: worked together over several months to come up with this product
- Scope (5 topic areas): TMDL, WQ Assessment, Nonpoint Source Management, WQ Monitoring, WQ Standards
- Subject matter experts were engaged, provided great feedback in limited time
- Rec 1 – Review and revise accountability framework

- o Don't want to change what we're accountable for, but want to look at evaluating our progress toward those goals in a different way
  - o This is vanguard, as it opens up a wide variety of alternatives for managers to consider beyond BMPs; social science, getting credit for changing behavior, etc.
- Rec 2 – Tiered approach for implementation
  - o Martha – asked Lee to expand on the 92 segments for the benefit of those in the group and online who may be unfamiliar
    - ▪ Lee – the bay is divided into 92 segments for the TMDL (92 separate TMDLs) but we focus mainly on CB4. However, TMDL says we need to satisfy WQ standards in all 92 segments. We are staying focused on deep water deep channel, but we have the opportunity to prioritize other 'things' (living resources, etc.) with more granularity
  - o Jill – when you do a jigsaw puzzle, do you start from the outside and work in, or the inside and work out? Outside and work in! Why? Because it's easier!
- Rec 3 – Promote cross-program coordination for water quality monitoring
  - o Important point of clarification: misconception exists that if data isn't used in the model, it isn't being used at all – not necessarily true! However, that doesn't mean that we couldn't find/use more and use it in a different (better) way. Coordination is key.
- Rec 4 – Provide opportunities to increase nonpoint source implementation
- Rec 5 – ID opportunities to expand on existing local liaisons programs

DISCUSSION

- Julie Wakeling: sensing that folks feel these recs are very technical... can we break the recs down into "tweaks" to what exists now versus radical changes to the current system?
  - o Jill: first two recommendations are transformational (how we measure success)
  - o Joe and Lee: ability to target things other than deep water/channel is huge, opportunities for flexibility, innovation; also, rec 3, bringing monitoring more to the forefront is a big shift
- Ruth Cassilly: did you consider point source at all? Conversation on NPDES permits in general and how we could enhance that to reduce the load outside of nonpoint source?
  - o Joe: we touched on it and it came up in conversations about the AF, but it didn't land clearly in any of our recommendations – it is a good point
- Gina Hunt: 1) heard that we needed near- and long-term targets (tiered approach), but exactly what do you mean by that? Don't WIPs have short- and long-term goals? 2) how are you deciding which BMPs you're putting in a place like the James River? Note: there is overlap with healthy watersheds here.
  - o Joe: near-term and far-term is part of tiered approach; we have 92 segments to clean up, and there will be a top ~10% of segments that we want to 'get to' first, so can we agree as a partnership to prioritize those segments? Long-term is still going to be CB4/deep water and channel.
  - o Lee: if there is local information, how can we give that to people to help them 'focus' their decisions? This targeting will be an ongoing activity.
-

- Wendy O'Sullivan: can we hear more about the group's conversations around clean water versus water quality – is 'clean water' meant to be primarily surface water? Groundwater? Drinking water?
    - Bryant: source water protection wasn't necessarily a driver in our discussions, but it isn't separable; conversations were very broad surrounding 'what is clean water?'
- Kevin Du Bois: did you consider plastics as part of clean water?
    - Ken Hyer: at SME level, they talked about emerging contaminants and talked about microplastics, PFAS, toxics, etc., framed it as 'we need to keep an eye on this'
- Jackie Specht: speak more to climate piece of work – what does this look like for your group?
    - Jill: stayed as high-level as possible, captured climate in multiple ways (not necessarily specifically called out); climate considerations are especially important when we talk with people about what they should be implementing to help with clean water goals
- Evan Isaacson: We didn't discuss some of the things that folks have asked about in this discussion - spent more time on other high-level ideas (e.g., what constitutes the accountability framework), didn't get to focus on things like source water versus groundwater as a driver, etc.

Session 2: Small Group Recommendations, Discussion Report Outs

- Public Group listening online:
    - Any decisions on goals and outcomes need to be grounded in engagement with people
        - Don't have the tools to engage with people to engage with the public
        - Not all of the public, but groups that are outside of the current signatories
        - The best mechanism is through local liaisons that exist throughout the watershed, not through state and federal governmental agencies
- Clean Water Group:
    - The group took clean water literally, so they focused on the TMDL
    - They incorporated all of the other aspects of clean water
    - There are opportunities for language improvement
        - Ex. Monitoring: make sure it is in line with local communities. Make sure models are the right models. Be clear with the phrase "accountability framework", so there is accountability for the other non-TMDL work inside the TMDL, and also accountability outside of the TMDL outcomes too
- Healthy Watersheds Group
    - Lots of connections across the small groups
    - Getting the recommendations for the EC to be very crisp is important
        - Fewer than 25 final outcomes for the EC
    - Good energy in the room
    - Communications is important, both internally and externally
    - A matrix of groups vs recommendations where there is overlap
    - Being more clear on language is important, internally and externally
    - Us vs them of the 5 small groups is something that we should work to dissolve over time, without losing the details

- o Strong facilitation is important
- o STAC comment:
  - Clarity and consistency of language is important
  - SMART goals
- Shallow Waters Group
  - o Language is important
  - o Confusion over a "shift" to shallow waters
    - The deep water trench is a valid indicator too
    - "Shallow water" definition, the group will refine this definition
  - o "Product over process"-> "Results over bureaucracy", or something similar
  - o Supporting materials provide context for all 5 small groups
  - o All recommendations should be given to the Beyond 2025 steering committee, even ones that don't meet consensus
  - o There is a lot more work for accountability moving forward across the outcomes
- Climate Small Group
  - o Where can the other recommendations fit in?
  - o How much change is the leadership of the partnership willing to move towards? Being bold or incremental change?
  - o Incorporating grass into ag recommendation
  - o Incorporating fisheries into aquatic ecosystem recommendation
  - o Market-based approaches includes carbon but also other resources too
  - o Lots of funding, how can we help partners use it?
  - o 25 recommendations is too many for the EC. However, climate recommendations can still stand alone (from someone not in the Climate Small Group)
- People Small Group
  - o Language matters
  - o Plan to stand behind the sentiment but tweak the language
  - o Reframe the discussion as an integration, a weaving between people, living resources, water quality
  - o The Bay Program can help make a difference in people's lives
  - o Lots of overlap between recommendations
    - Accountability
    - Networks
    - Social science
  - o Governance and accountability: different ask than from what ERG is currently doing
  - o DEIJ is the window and framework to look through their recommendations

Day 2, February 29th

Opening Comments

- Alignment
- Focusing the work
- Partnership
- Logistics

Session 3: Visioning Exercise Report-Outs

- Visioning products created by the different groups.
    - Diverse local communities actively connected with nature, clean water, healthy and resilient lands.
    - Local communities treasure the places that improve their quality of life and connect them to their history, culture, and natural world.

      or

      Homes and communities who love and care for natural land and water resources to provide jobs, health, and enjoyment now and into the future.

    - Because the health and wellbeing of our residents depends on a healthy environment and sound government policy, the Chesapeake Bay Program envisions a collaborative partnership that works to improve and sustain the health of Chesapeake Bay, streams, and rivers by supporting clean water for thriving native species, fostering equitable stewardship, local, cultural, and economic vitality, for present and future generations.
    - We envision a Chesapeake Bay watershed that is vibrant, healthy, sustainable, thriving and resilient for people and nature in diverse and engaged communities.
    - Vibrant and diverse communities supported by healthy local waters and living resources and lands in a changing Chesapeake ecosystem.
    - Ensure the well-being and equitable access of all people who live, work, and recreate on the lands and waters of the Chesapeake region by supporting adaptability of communities and nature to climate change through inclusive collaboration.
    - A Chesapeake Bay Program of diverse local communities actively connected with nature, clean water, and healthy and resilient lands.
    - We recognize an urgency to act for present and future generations by empowering communities of healthy people celebrating diversity and values.
- Wendy O'Sullivan and Britt Slattery: We should put people at the front of the vision statement.
- Jeff Lerner: The vision statement could cover the outcome, not the means.
- Kristen Wolf: Kept it really high level to speak language that the public knows, and put people at the beginning of the vision. They put nature in as well as an overarching term for the environment.
- Kevin Du Bois: Simplified language is important. Love and care are important before people act.

- Greg Barranco: Thinks we need to make some changes to the vision statement. Chesapeake Bay is in the vision statement twice, which is one or 2 times too many.
- Martha Shimkin: Likes that her group started and ended with people.
- Brittany Hall: Present and future generations is important. Resilient is future-looking, but historic injustices are important too. Nature and people being separated is very Eurocentric, and different from how many Native Americans view nature.
- Matt Rowe: People and communities, maybe communities is a better phrase.
- Breck Sullivan: It is important to include climate in the vision.
- Heidi Bonnaffon: Conserved lands is there now, but what happens on developed lands is important too.
- Peter Tango: Measuring impacts to people at different scales has a lot of unpacking to do.
- Top 6 words from the visioning exercise: Communities, diversity, healthy, local, water, people
- Kevin Schabow: All 6 words are plain language, which is a really good thing, and something to include in the CBP's vision statement.

Session 4: Addressing the EC Charge: How will we refine the recommendations?

PRESENTATION

- Phase 2 will execute the direction that we set in Phase 1
- Getting from individual recommendations to a path forward:
  - Define the set of standard info needed for each rec: one page per recommendation.
  - Combine recommendations (not necessary if it doesn't make sense for your recs!)
  - Categorize recs based on whether they impact agreement, partnership, both, neither.
  - Measure/record level of consensus/comfort within SC around pursuing each rec in P2
    - All recs will move through in appendix of SC's product (25 sheets of paper with standardized info)
    - Use consensus continuum for each rec to highlight where there is strength of support and where more discussion is needed.
  - Determine scope of work ahead with these recs in mind

DISCUSSION

- Jill Whitcomb – when do we talk about the resources that will be needed to make the changes outlined in our recommendations? EC is going to want to know what these changes will cost in dollars, personnel, etc.; we came at this in a good way, looking at what we can do to make things better, but we haven't yet been directed to talk about what it will take.
  - Anna – this is an important point and a good question for breakout discussion
- Jess Blackburn – Do we need to have the product for the EC by September? Can we have an extended public comment period now given the later date of the meeting? How should the public expect to see their comments used in the process?
  - Anna – we aren't planning to extend the public comment period; additional time ahead of the EC meeting can be dedicated to drafting/review of final product for EC

- o Anna – Public comments will be considered in revision process – this will be discussed later today.
- Larry Sanford – Can steps 2 and 3 (combining recs, categorizing recs) be reversed or put together? Categorization may inform combination.
  - o Anna – they are "combined" in that they are happening at same time in the timeline; this can be discussed more in breakout.
- Kevin Du Bois – Curious about December EC mtg: is all of this info going to be presented to them in public session or during a closed-door session? Will we be there as resources for them if they have questions?
  - o We will need MB and PSC members to be talking to EC reps about this information ahead of time so they are sufficiently informed/prepared to meaningfully discuss at the meeting.
- Kevin Schabow – At what level of granularity will the EC be operating when they discuss this? In some ways, it seems like the level of detail we're providing here would be more suitable for P2.
  - o Phase 2 will include more detail than Phase 1; PSC members will get together in fall before EC meeting to brief across the federal agencies and prepare the EPA administrator for the EC.
- James Martin – you said "a recommendation" for the EC: how do you see all of this rolling into one rec?
  - o The one "recommendation" is the charge for what we need to do to kick off P2. What work are we kicking off to fully execute what they've been presented with through P1.
- James Martin – for the categorization step in getting to the path forward, James proposes more boxes (in addition to agreement and partnership) for lumping recommendations, including science and restoration.
- Breck Sullivan – Another question about the language "a recommendation": where is this coming from? Is this somewhere in the charge, is it something the Steering Committee decided?
  - o Anna – when we broke it up in phases, we understood that in one year we wouldn't fully know how we would change all that we want to change. This year we took a snapshot of how much needs to happen which is what we are sharing with them between P1 and P2
  - o "recommendation" in phrase "A recommendation to the EC" may not be correct word.
- Kristin Reilly – referencing the draft SC recommendations box in the presentation: are the recommendations that we have been working on going to be presented to the EC?
  - o Anna – the final product is going to include all recommendations in the appendix, and they will all be part of the material supporting the big picture of what P2 looks like
- Greg Barranco – Is there going to be an impact assessment? What is the scope of the recommendation to the EC? Just amend, extend and rewrite?
  - o Anna – scope is up to us and that is what we need to discuss, that is what we are going to send to the EC with the small group recs included.
  - o Martha – the Steering Committee previously defined what the product would be (~Oct. 2023), it decided that we need to look at all of the recs that the small groups defined to help justify what our overall "rec" is going to be; we are still working with the plan that was previously defined.

- Jill Whitcomb: need to be clear that it is a set of recommendations in one final product, this is what it was in the EC charge; need to know what we're looking at doing with the small group work, and if there is an expectation that we come up with something that says we need to revise, or amend or extend etc. the Watershed Agreement
    - Anna – expectation is that we will tell the EC the level of change that is going to be up for discussion in Phase 2: What is on the table? What we've collected is going to inform a one-page picture for the EC of the future work that is going to need to happen.
- Peter Tango: If he was in EC chair role, would be asking if what we found in P1 says that what we have in place is working, or not. Crosswalk all recs and proposals – are we doing this?
    - Anna – Agreed with Peter, and clarified that the crosswalk begins in March, ends by time draft is out.
- Gina Hunt: It may be a shock to the group that the 25 recommendations are already broad, might condense those a little bit, but those are all going to be an appendix? Feels like an afterthought. With all the work that went into this, needs more emphasis than being an appendix.
    - Anna – Keep this in mind for when we get to sharing the draft outline.
- Stefanie Taillon: can we not call it a singular recommendation? Sounds like you're asking for a charge. An ask? Finding?
- Stefanie Taillon: what is the plan for the presentation in the afternoon for what we're delivering to the PSC? Still unsure what that final product will be
    - Sherry – we'll think about how we structure the breakout session and plenary discussions (order of operations, what we talk about first)
- Katie Brownson – unclear whether we really agreed to roll this into one single "recommendation"; if there will be an effort to develop a charge for P2, need to think about what that effort looks like
    - We are going to revisit this thought in the afternoon session.
- Britt Slattery: How do we standardize our information? If we're going to process recommendations, we need some guiding questions.
    - Sherry: We have those guiding questions in a PowerPoint slide, and will discuss the process of standardizing and synthesizing for the EC more this afternoon
- Kristin Reilly: There is a challenge with trust around this process, maybe get feedback about whether or not there is trust around this.
- *An informal vote was taken, and it was determined to continue with the agenda for the day as is. Groups broke out into breakout sessions.*

Session 4: Steering Committee Breakout "Bucketing" Exercise Report Outs

- Bruce Vogt's group:
    - What recommendations are transformational and what are refinements? What are feasible and what are aspirational?

- The 5 small groups could remeet in the coming weeks to discuss what they heard from this small group process and from the other recommendations to put together a more refined group of recommendations for the Phase 1 process.
- What are the actions that need to be addressed in Phase 2? This could also be discussed in the small groups.

- Joe Wood's group:
  - What is the impact, what are the common themes and degree of change?
  - Representation from lots of groups
  - Lots of synergy
  - Still unsure about what some of the recommendations from the small groups mean.
  - Buckets of recommendations:
    - Accountability framework: there were lots of points here. There could be value in making an accountability framework recommendation.
    - Data and science and connecting the work to outcomes.
    - Connecting with people
    - Climate
  - His group observed in the conversations and recommendations a tension between the Clean Water Act outcomes and the other outcomes.

- Larry Sanford's group
  - Ecosystems, Regulations, People are the three main buckets in the Bay Program
  - Regulations:
    - Monitoring,
    - Modeling
    - WQ contaminants
    - Accountability
    - Science
    - Climate
  - Ecosystems
    - Habitat
    - Living resources
    - Climate
    - Science
    - Surface water
    - Monitoring and modeling
  - People
    - Local
    - Communities
    - Partnership,
    - DEIJ
    - Social Sciences
    - DEIJ
    - Networks

- o Could map all of the recommendations into a Venn diagram with circles around those 3 buckets.
- Gina Hunt's group
    - o Extend or rewrite.
    - o Partnership structure
    - o Resources to do it
    - o Bucket the recommendations into groups.
        - ▪ Science
        - ▪ Restoration
        - ▪ Partnership
        - ▪ Accountability
        - ▪ Future
        - ▪ Communication
        - ▪ Goals and outcomes
- Matt Rowe's group
    - o Buckets
        - ▪ Goals, governance, accountability, adaptive management
        - ▪ Networks, capacity building, community engagement
        - ▪ Science, planning and implementation.
        - ▪ Climate Resilience
        - ▪ People/communities, DEIJ
        - ▪ Crosscutting DEIJ and climate
    - o Not losing the detail in recommendations is important.
    - o Standardization of information:
        - ▪ What needs to be standardized?
        - ▪ What is the recommendation, why is it there, how to get it done (consideration of resources)
    - o James Martin question: Did you, Matt, try to force recommendations into a single bucket or allow them to cross buckets?
    - o Matt Rowe: Both, depending on the recommendation.

Session 4: Addressing the EC Charge: What will we deliver to the Executive Council?

Anna led presentation of slides, breaking periodically for discussion.

- Larry Sanford: Does 'values' mean 'how valuable are we as a program', or does it mean 'what are our values'?
    - o Anna: Both – Value was split into two questions, 'what is the value that the partnership offers to that topic/idea?', and 'what value does the topic/idea provide to the Chesapeake?'
- James Martin: recommendations on the partnership may need to be broadened from what we might have thought initially
    - o *Handwritten big-picture graphic was presented to the group.*

- o Anna: Since our first meeting (where there wasn't yet a clear direction – our purpose was to find that direction), we've been building the path ahead for our program. We feel firmly that our product needs to lead with bottom line up front; under the 'bottom line' are our synthesized recommendations, and forming the base of our product are our source materials: ALL recommendations and the ERG report.
  - o IN SUMMARY: the product for the EC will be the "bottom line up front" (a shorter version of the "what are we doing", synthesized recommendations (a longer version of the what), and the source material (this will form the "why").

DRAFT OUTLINE OF EC PRODUCT

- 1-2 pages of critical path forward
  - o Our charge, the bottom-line up front, and our vision for the partnership
- Page 3+ - synthesis and alignment
  - o Our process and what informed our work, more detailed, categorized findings, and summary of public engagement and outreach.
- Source materials
  - o 1-page narratives for each small group recommendation
  - o Final ERG report

DISCUSSION

- Wendy O'Sullivan: ERG's process and product is unclear (particularly as related to how it will be delivered in the steering committee's final product). Would it be both "source material" and "synthesized findings"? Also, who will get to see what ERG develops?
  - o EPA owns the contract, but everyone is going to get to see the report.
  - o Ken Hyer, Martha Shimkin – Entire ERG report will live in source material, but pieces of the report that we deem significant will move up to synthesized findings.
- Gina Hunt: Is the "one-pager" concept for the small group recommendations negotiable (perhaps two-pagers or three-pagers would be better)? We will lose good information if we keep it to one page; 2) are we putting the answers to the questions of, for example, what are the resource needs of this recommendation, in the synthesized findings?
  - o Anna: Put it in the one-pager in source materials, but it may be bumped up into synthesized findings.
  - o Holding off on the one pager question for now
- Joe Wood: grouping the commonalities that we discussed is helpful, but that doesn't get to the bottom-line intent of the recommendation; giving the small groups the opportunity to decide "what is our bottom line" could be useful.
  - o Point noted, may have come from confusion about what the groups will be providing for source material (one page per recommendation, which can contain bottom-line point)
- Jill Whitcomb: tiptoeing around this: source materials not necessarily what will be in synthesized findings, not every single recommendation will be carried forward, consensus continuums. Throughout of going to the SC, MB; don't get married to the words in your recs because they may change, and some may get dropped.

- o   Martha: source materials will have one page for each recommendation, in synthesized findings. Of the 25 current recommendations, they'll be combined, maybe restated, some may not be elevated.
- Brittany Hall: proposed statement [in the chat] to be the "bottom line up front" for the EC.
- Matt Rowe: framework is workable, helpful; some of the recs are very specific as to the how, maybe we're also proposing some things that are better suited for P2; ERG product will fit well within the triangle because of the evaluation questions we gave them (organizational structure, etc.)
- James Martin: framework is useful, wonders if we should make it a pyramid instead of triangle (bottom line up front is three elements); cramming everything into one bottom line up front might not be possible.
- Jess Blackburn: are we pausing and allowing leaders to lead in this process? Lot of work to put together resource needs, etc., for 25 recommendations, it is a ton of effort and if the PSC/EC says it is a non-starter, that is a big waste of time.
    - o   At next PSC meeting, Martha and Anna will be addressing what came of the symposium, and many of us will continuously be briefing up to the PSC members so we can make sure it aligns with what they want (no blindsides at the meetings)
    - o   Anna: when we brief the PSC in March, we have 25 mins to present and 25 mins to discuss, only so much info we can share; we want to have one-pagers wrapped up by end of March.
- Julia Wakeling: how is the SC, small groups going to digest the ERG report.
    - o   The ERG report is going to be touched on briefly later today.
- Dave Montali: respectfully disagree with bottom line starting with change the agreement/partnership because he thinks we may get a non-starter from the PSC, WV is primarily in it for WQ side of things, and the WQ goals are achievable without the overhaul of agreement/partnership.
- Kristin Reilly: bottom line up front is still somewhat predetermined, right? Agreement/partnership is still what is on the table? Through the process, we may come up with other 'bottom line up front' comments and shouldn't restrict ourselves with predetermined recommendations; if there is already hesitation with what we're proposing in bottom line up front, we need to think about making a rec that all signatories see themselves in
    - o   Anna: agreement/partnership in bottom line up front because they are the foundational drivers of our work together. Answer could be that we don't need to change the two foundational pieces, there could be a third element that needs to be changed/addressed, but those are our placeholders because they are the bedrock of what we do. Not trying to pen ourselves in.
- Katie Brownson: phase one was supposed to focus on the what rather than the how (resources, etc.), some difference among the group's recommendations – some go down the 'how' path, others don't, would be good to have a common framework for what we're trying to work into the framework.

PRESENTATION

- *This section of the presentation was primarily focused on product timeline.*

DISCSUSION

- Jill Whitcomb: We need to draft the "one-pager" for each recommendation ahead of the March steering committee meeting, correct?
  - Yes.
- Jill Whitcomb: What do each of the one-pagers entail?
  - We are going to determine the answer to this question in the final session of the day today.
- Matt Rowe: Expressed concern about ERG timeline extending into public comment period. Can we "sync" these timelines better?
  - Doug Bell: ERG is well on their way to having a product for us, and we're going to get core feedback from them in April. In other words, timeline is not necessarily as extended as it seems. Draft is coming by April steering committee meeting.
  - Wendy O'Sullivan: seeing this timeline, it is clear that the federal interviews need to get scheduled as soon as possible.
  - Rachel Felver: timing of public comment/engagement seems to be accelerated compared to what was initially discussed (thinking it was going to start in July, now going to happen in June)
- KC Filippino: Are we going to be shopping our product around to workgroups, GITs, other parts of the partnership, during public comment period? What does that look like?
  - Anna: Yes, shopping the draft around to the GITs, workgroups, action teams, etc., will have to happen at the same time as public engagement
- Ken Hyer: For the steering committee draft, we aren't going to have 60 people co-write it, correct? How, as a group, will we compose that draft?
  - Anna: most of that drafting is going to fall on Martha and Anna, with general support
- Greg Barranco: Flagged that the December PSC meeting has been shifted to November but will likely need to be moved to late October to ensure jurisdictional EC members can receive materials 6 weeks in advance of EC meeting.
  - **ACTION: When refining the timeline, there is a need to accommodate an earlier PSC meeting, and determine implications on the timeline for other B25 activities/products (public engagement, SC draft, etc.)**
- Wendy O'Sullivan: Please put on next SC agenda to discuss whether the draft that is written will be a consensus document
- Kevin Schabow: To what extent does the B25 Steering Committee have autonomy in decision making from the PSC? Even if we could come to consensus on a recommendation, does the PSC still have the ability to say 'no, we're not doing that'? Is that a problem?
  - Anna: there are levels at which consensus can happen – we may be comfortable with the source materials, but when we move up to the next two synthesis levels, it may not just be the B25SC's deciding what stays. For example, the PSC <u>must</u> be comfortable with the "bottom-line up front" piece, while they aren't deciding what is included in source materials

- o Martha: best to know what your PSC member is going to say before the meeting, get us proposals with how to address concerns beforehand.
- Bryant Thomas: Can we set a target deadline for the one-pagers for our recommendations?
  - o We are going to discuss this in our final session today.
- Dave Montali: We are going to have a 60-day comment period and will probably receive a large number of comments. Are we going to do a response summary to comments received? If so, we probably won't have enough time.
  - o Martha Shimkin: This is not a formal comment and response activity, so we are not planning to write a response document.
  - o Julie Lawson: We will probably receive pushback to our decision to not formally respond to comments.
    - ▪ **ACTION: The Steering Committee needs to more clearly outline how they are going to address public comments.**
  - o Katie Brownson: We should at least consider committing to responding to comments from advisory committees.

Session 5: The Path Forward

- **ACTION: The small groups will write a 1-page document per recommendation in preparation for the late March B25 Steering Committee meeting.**
- Details of the 1-pager for each recommendation
  - o Short description
  - o Why
  - o Does this impact how we work or what we do?
  - o Transformative? Enhanced?
    - ▪ Amend, extend, rewrite
  - o General level of effort/resources
  - o Any discussion on how? Strategies
- Ken Hyer: Question on how
  - o "How" strategies was added as a bullet point by Anna
- Jill Whitcomb had a process question on the outline
- Gina Hunt: Question on how "amend, extend, rewrite" recommendation fits into each individual recommendation's 1-pager
  - o Lee McDonnell helped clarify the purpose of the 1-pager
- Matt Rowe: Is there room for some areas of recommendation to be "do it internally"?
  - o This was added to the outline
- James Martin: We should specify what parts of the partnership should be amended, extended, etc.
  - o Anna added this to the outline
- Breck Sullivan: Has there been discussion on how the recommendations are picked for the next step after this one? Should that be part of the outline?
- Bo Williams: We should standardize "level of effort" in the outline
  - o Martha agrees and thinks level of effort should include time and cost
- **ACTION: The Chairs will distribute a template and guidance for the one-pager to the Beyond 2025 Steering Committee.**

- **ACTION: Design the March Steering Committee agenda using the elements outlined below, which capture the conversation in the room.**
  - Discussion of 1-pagers
  - Consensus check on Beyond 2025 process
  - Continue recommendation synthesis discussion
    - Amend, extend rewrite?
  - Public engagement plan
  - As recommendations go up the line, will there be a consensus continuum process?
  - Discuss SC's Beyond 2025 report drafting process
    - Consensus approach; dissenting opinions
  - Report back from PSC/STAC meetings that took place in March
  - Timeline check-in
- Katie Brownson: Is there a role for steering committee members to divide up into drafting teams, or other opportunities to help draft the final Beyond 2025 Phase 1 report?
- Gabe Cohee: Agreed with Katie
- Matt Rowe: Can you put the timeline on the March agenda?
  - Put on the agenda
- Laura Cattell Noll and Jill Whitcomb: How about a poll on the 25 recommendations among the steering committee members?
- Doug Bell: Do we want a 3 hour meeting?
  - Ken Hyer: We're on a tight timeline and need to consider longer meeting if necessary
- James Martin: Consensus check in- could be valuable to see if there are stops right now? Advocates for a poll in advance
  - Martha called for a general sense if the survey should take place now
  - Julie Lawson asked if there would be better to wait until the 1 pagers are discussed
  - Jill: Alternate proposal: If there are nonstarters already, we should probably tell them now. Maybe weighing in now could be good, as well as doing one after the March steering committee meeting
  - Jill: A gut check across the steering committee could be valuable to help the small groups tweak their recommendations. For example, accountability. Some have said we can bring in other outcomes under the current accountability framework. It would be valuable to know now if this is a nonstarter, so recommendations can be reconfigured for buy-in
- Brittany Hall: Believes that recommendations that do not have consensus should be included too. Proposes allowing comments on the 25 recommendations, then allowing the small groups to write the 1 pagers with the knowledge that all 25 will be pushed forward in some capacity
- Matt Rowe: Wants to make sure there is something to react to in such a pulse proposed by Brittany. Perhaps the overarching recommendations through Google Docs
- Anna: A consensus check will not happen in March.
  - **ACTION: Chairs will think through how to possibly provide a pulse check on the recommendations before the March steering committee meeting.**
- Perhaps through a small workgroup co-leads and SC chairs meeting together. All of the 1 pagers will still be made

- Bryant Thomas: We need to be cognizant of the limited timeframe we're operating under. Perhaps a parking lot for ideas that are more appropriate for Phase 2
- Stefanie Taillon: Agrees with Bryant. Keeping in levels of governance is important
- Katie Brownson: Is it not worth getting consensus on the recommendations, and instead focus on getting a consensus this summer on the final Phase 1 report?
- James Martin: A lot of the 25 recommendations have overlap. Do we want to winnow them down?
  - Anna: The small groups should come back with a one-pager on each of the 25 recommendations, and synthesis will happen at/after the March steering committee meeting.
  - Anna: There will not be a consensus check in March on agreements, further discussion if and when there will be one
- Sherry and Gina: Recommends putting the recommendations into buckets, then synthesizing
  - Anna: The buckets will be developed in March steering committee meeting, then synthesizing will take place (in a way that will also be discussed in March)
- Jill Whitcomb: What will the PSC members need to be prepared for their own March meeting?
  - **ACTION: Martha and Anna will prepare a presentation for the PSC by end of week of March 8**
  - **ACTION: Steering committee members will let Steering Committee chairs know if their PSC members have questions or concerns after seeing the presentation**
- Matt Rowe: Can the Chairs develop draft buckets by the end of next week for steering committee?
  - Anna: **ACTION: Yes, the Chairs will consider a way to include draft buckets of recommendations in the March 2024 PSC presentation.**
  - Sherry Witt agrees the team is ready but knows there will be feedback on the proposed buckets so doesn't want to recommend at this time
  - Anna: Buckets will be finalized after the March meeting
- Wrap up:
  - Martha: Thank you and she has confidence in the team assembled
  - Anna: Thank you and acknowledgement of the work ahead. Working together on next steps

ACTIONS

Day 1

- [VOLUNTARY] **Kevin Du Bois** plans to distribute a literature review article on carbon sequestration.

Day 2

- When refining the timeline, **the Steering Committee** needs to accommodate an earlier PSC meeting, and determine implications on the timeline for other B25 activities/products (public engagement, SC draft, etc.)
- **The Steering Committee** needs to better outline how we are going to address public comments.
- **The Small groups** will write a 1-page document per recommendation in preparation for the late March B25 Steering Committee meeting.
- **The Chairs** will distribute a template and guidance for the one-pager to the Beyond 2025 Steering Committee.
- **The Chairs** will design the March Steering Committee agenda using the elements outlined below, which capture the conversation in the room.
    - *Discussion of 1-pagers*
    - *Consensus check on Beyond 2025 process*
    - *Continue recommendation synthesis discussion*
        - *Amend, extend rewrite?*
    - *Public engagement plan*
    - *As recommendations go up the line, will there be a consensus continuum process?*
    - *Discuss SC's Beyond 2025 report drafting process*
        - *Consensus approach; dissenting opinions*
    - *Report back from PSC/STAC meetings that took place in March*
    - *Timeline check-in*
- **The Chairs** will determine how to possibly provide a pulse check on the recommendations before the March steering committee meeting.
- **The Chairs** will prepare a presentation for the March PSC meeting by end of week of March 8
    - **Steering Committee members** will let Steering Committee chairs know if their PSC members have questions or concerns after seeing the presentation (and at other points along the B25 timeline).
    - **The Chairs** will consider a way to include draft buckets of recommendations in the March 2024 PSC presentation.