SUMMARY OF DECISIONS AND ACTIONS
CBP WQGIT BMP Verification Committee
Conference Call
Thursday, July 31, 2014, 9:00AM – 11:00AM
www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/21910/

Welcome, Introductions, and Objectives of Today's Conference Call
- Rich Batiuk stated that today's conference call objective was to reach Committee consensus on resolution of the comments received on May 12th draft framework.
- He asked the members to focus on the key 24 comments which need the Committee's input on working from the proposed set of responses to each comment.
- The Committee also needed to discuss and agree on the initial responses and next steps for resolution of the three overarching issues identified by the Agriculture Workgroup for resolution by the BMP Verification Committee.

Discussion of resolution of comments on the May 12, 2014 revised draft BMP Verification Framework

Comment 1
- James Davis Martin, VA DEQ: The guiding document would be results of the process, not just the process.
- Roy Hoagland, HOPE Impacts: I have no problem with the structure proposed. To move workgroups' source sector/habitat specific guidance to an appendix is a mistake – people think they don't need to look at appendices, and it's the heart of the guidance. No problem with them being after the overarching summary, but not an appendix.
- Andy Zemba, PA DEP: So the motion on the table is to restructure the document, make it more efficient, no significant changes to the substance?
- Rich Batiuk, EPA CBPO: Yes.
- Andy Zemba: Sounds logical, I support it. Let's keep focused on the substance, make the needed organizational changes, but not make further detailed changes.
- Russ Baxter, VA DEQ: It's a much easier document to understand. I support the proposed changes.

DECISION: The next revised draft of the basinwide verification framework report will be further reorganized so that the guidance directed to the jurisdictions is contained in the up-front report and other supporting information is provided in the appendices. The following changes will be made in the next revised draft report:

- Put the acknowledgements into an appendix
- Move the text on pages 4 to the top of page 11 either into a new section 2, into the existing appendices, or delete as duplicative

- Move the existing Section 2—Source Sector/Habitat Specific BMP Verification Guidance—to a new appendix
- Work to remove duplicative text throughout the remaining pages

Comment 2
- Roy Hoagland: I don't think we need to highlight it. I think when things are rearranged that will come through more as an important point. The issue of cost effectiveness is already address up-front in the BMP verification principles.
- Andy Zemba: Disagreed with Roy's perspective. This is a recurring theme we're going to hear. People are very worried about the cost, worried that money is being used for verification instead of on the ground implementation. We need to clearly communicate that we are working to implement BMP verification in the most cost effective way as possible. I thought there was a suggestion to add something to the principles. We need to be broader.
- Russ Baxter: Putting it right up front will make it clear this is an issue we'll continue to look at, that we recognize its importance. I recommend highlighting it as much as we highlight the principles adopted in December.
- Roy Hoagland: Will there be a transmittal letter with this?
- Rich Batiuk: There will not be a transmittal letter, but we have a 1 page foreword message from Nick. Are you suggesting that's this is a place to place emphasis on this topic?
- Roy Hoagland: Recommend we highlight the difficulty with this, need of cost-effectiveness in foreword.
- Russ Baxter: I'd suggest to amend Dec 2012 principles to add cost effectiveness as a principle.
- Roy Hoagland: I am not in support of changing the BMP verification principles this late in the process, particularly given all the workgroups have completed their work on their verification guidance.
- Russ Baxter: I am less supportive of it only going in a transmittal letter.

DECISION: An additional focus will be placed on the need for full consideration of cost effectiveness in the implementation BMP verification up front in the foreword. The BMP verification principles will be brought forward in the report itself given the language recognizes the reality of funding constraints.

Comment 3
- Rich Batiuk: Dave Montali's comment is suggesting that our federal agency partners pull their BMP verification documentation and make it publically accessible so the individual jurisdictions can reference the federal agencies' verification protocols and procedures within their respective quality assurance plans.
- Roy Hoagland: The Agriculture Workgroup has wrestled with this same topic of federal agency involvement. The Agriculture Workgroup didn't have the authority or prestige to

get federal partners to do something different they what they are currently already doing. The Agriculture Workgroup recommended that EPA take on and reconcile this issue with its sister agencies (USDA). EPA needs to be the one negotiating with other federal agencies for what is a program-wide response to verification on cost-share practices.

- Rich Batiuk: The Agriculture Workgroup's concern is related to Dave Montali's comments. Everyone is trying to separately track down USDA's BMP verification documentation.
- Roy Hoagland: Part of the reason for the difficulty is there was a recognition that the USDA's BMP verification program is not based on pollution reduction. It's based on money spent and practice implementation problems.
- James Davis Martin: We're not just talking about a USDA issue; there are other federal agencies who have BMP data as well which the states report and need access to their BMP verification protocols and procedures documentation.
- George Onyullo, DC DOE: We support this comment. The proposed response is good for us.
- Sarah Diebel, U.S. DoD: DOD agrees.
- Susan Marquart, USDA NRCS: There are differences between states, who handles data, how they handle data. I don't necessarily think states with existing 1619 agreements are broken – it would make more sense to work on how to get common data sets rather than common agreements. EPA and USDA can try to work through these things.
- Rich Batiuk: Let's move forward with the proposed response. We need to keep focused on the full breadth of partners involved with funding, supporting putting in practices reported to jurisdictions that have ultimate responsibility. We'll highlight the need to further engage of our federal agency partners with the Management Board, Principals' Staff Committee, Federal Office Directors, and Federal Leadership Committee.
- James Davis Martin: Ultimately, it's the jurisdictions' responsibility for all of the BMP data their report. If federal partners don't have adequate verification systems on their own, that means the federal BMP implementation data doesn't get reported. The jurisdictions can't force ourselves access to a DOD facility to verify something the facility managers haven't adequately verified themselves.

DECISION: In the revised draft framework report, CBPO staff will include a commitment by federal partners to provide specific documentable references to/develop new agency specific BMP verification documentation which each jurisdiction can cite/reference/link to within its quality assurance plan documentation.

In terms of "common, universal, consistent 1619 agreements for all Partnership jurisdictions", that is exactly the intended outcomes of the Partnership's adoption of the basinwide framework and the consistent 1619 language negotiated with our NRCS and FSA colleagues. The BMP Verification Committee made the decision last year not to pursue a single, multiple jurisdictional 1619 agreement based on NRCS's advice, instead focusing on common language and addressing issues facing all jurisdictions (e.g., signing 1619 agreements with agencies with both conservation delivery and regulatory responsibilities).

Comment 4
- Andy Zemba: I was looking at LGAC's comments more in terms of cost-effectiveness. We're working on that with them. There's no prioritization of… we're addressing a concern of cost effectiveness.
- Rich Batiuk: LGAC wants to be sure there's not a conflict between local governments' requirements vs states' requirements.
- Russ Baxter: I don't think that's an issue. On the regulatory side they're obliged to do these things – it heightens the chance that this stuff is getting done, if it's not they're in trouble.
- Mary Gattis, ACB: LGAC is establishing better communication channels. There are large areas of local governments that are not subject to these regulations. They don't want to be on the hook for things that weren't communicated.
- James Davis Martin: The guidance gives us flexibility in developing alternatives to WIPs.

DECISION: The Committee agreed that the existing framework text provides the partners with the flexibility to address LGAC's comment as the jurisdictions work to enhance their existing BMP tracking and reporting programs to incorporate more emphasis on verification.

Comment 5

DECISION: The Committee agreed this comment has already been address in the current draft basinwide BMP verification framework report.

Comment 6
- Russ Baxter: We should be very clear about the governance of this. I think it says later that EPA is the ultimate decision maker here and the review panel is advisory to EPA. A checklist process might be used in the advisory capacity, but they are not in power to approve or disapprove state programs, they are only providing EPA their advice.
- Rich Batiuk: Recommend we pick up on what Russ mentioned and ensure it's addressed in response to another comment which follows, clearly confining the role of the panel, the proper use of the checklist and the six workgroups' BMP verification guidance as the Panel reviews' the jurisdictions' BMP verification plans. The Panel is advisory; EPA is the decision maker.

ACTION: CBPO staff will edit the report as needed to clarify the advisory role of the Panel and the decision making role of EPA as well as how the checklist and the six sets of workgroup BMP verification guidance will be used in the Panel's review and as part of EPA's decision making.

Comment 7
- Rich Batiuk: We should be sure there's full opportunity for adapting of the jurisdictions' WIPs over time and concurrent adaptation of the jurisdictions' BMP verification programs.

- James Davis Martin: On the 2nd paragraph in the proposed response, we shouldn't be quite as stringent the jurisdictions must vary the level of verification based on the relative importance of individual or groups of BMP. My read of the guidance does allow jurisdictions flexibility to do so, but does not say the justification must. The trouble is a number of BMPs that end up achieving most reductions are also BMPs that have a very low risk of failure.
- Roy Hoagland: There's nothing in the guidance that says that's how you have to target reductions.
- Rich Batiuk: the Panel wanted to ensure the jurisdictions had this flexibility but did not intend to force it upon them.

ACTION: CBPO staff will review and edit the basinwide framework report, as needed, to capture the Committee's discussions of this comment, ensuring the jurisdictions have the needed flexibility but are not required to vary the level of verification based on BMP importance.

Comment 8
- Rich Batiuk: Should we put together such a graphic?
- James Davis Martin: I support it.

ACTION: In preparation for presentation of the draft final basinwide BMP verification framework to the CBP Management Board, CBPO staff will prepare a gantt chart outlining the process between PSC approval of the framework and two years out. The chart will be presented to the Management Board and, with their approval, incorporated into the final framework document for presentation to the PSC.

Comment 9

DECISION: The Committee addressed this comment under its response to comment 6 above.

Comment 10: Dave Montali
- Rich Batiuk: We need to clarify that it's a request to the partnership for such an evaluation, not the advisory committees. The partners could choose to ask the advisory committees to sponsor a review.
- Russ Baxter: I wonder if it's even appropriate to have this recommendation. The advisory committees advise the Executive Council and the PSC. To pull it out as something important to this effort is not necessary. We as partners always have the option to request an evaluation. As LGAC pointed out, they'd have to gear up for such a evaluation which is beyond their current charge. STAC is independent in how they select what issues they take up and evaluate. I think being silent on this topic within the framework report doesn't change the fact that the advisory committee will continue give us advice on this, and anything that affects the program. Who requested this recommendation?
- Rich: I put in this recommendation upon hearing STAC members wanting an opportunity to evaluate the larger, basinwide BMP verification process at some point in the not too

distant future. The advisory committees did not specifically request it. It is important to say there will be reviews. We're not going to get it perfect the first time around.

- Andy Zemba: Evaluations are important, but it becomes a question of which are needed and how often do evaluations need to be done.

DECISION: The Committee agreed to delete the evaluation recommendation but retain the Partners ability to ask for future reviews as well as emphasize opportunities for change and modification as we learn new things over time.

Comment 11
- Rich Batiuk: If no one objects, we'll capture and apply in response to this comment what we have already decided in response to the previous comments.

DECISION: The Committee addressed this comment under its response to comment 3 above.

Comment 12
- Rich Batiuk: Each of these topics are address either in the basinwide verification framework (e.g., practices lifespans, historical data clean up) or as part of the ongoing or planned the work under the 2017 Chesapeake Bay TMDL Midpoint Assessment (e.g., cutoff of reported practices).
- James Davis Martin: It's not necessarily in the document, so it's good to capture what the partners are doing to resolve these issues in all these instances as well as in the BMP verification guidance.

ACTION: CBPO staff will work to ensure these is clear documentation within the Midpoint Assessment process on who and how the partners are addressing practices lifespans, historical data clean up, and reported practices cutoffs outside of the basinwide BMP verification framework.

Comments 13 & 14
- Russ Baxter: Comments 13 & 14 were overarching comments and we've already addressed them.

Comments 15 & 16
- Rich: Need feedback from Committee members on the utility of setting up webinars with presentations by the workgroup chairs, workgroup coordinators, EPA, or a combination of partners to bring in a wider circle of engaged partners and stakeholders, either as we make our way to the PSC or after the PSC makes the final decisions on the framework.
- Andy Zemba: Great idea. Webinars are a good forum for this type of outreach and communication
- Rich Batiuk: What type of webinars would you like to see?
- Roy Hoagland: This is a big ask. This has been a long process, with lots of sector by sector complexity. It would be great if the Bay Program can do a comprehensive

overview of some sort. I'm not keen on each workgroup chair presenting independently – it could defeat the purpose of a comprehensive education. But it would be great to proceed with such a series of webinars.

- Beth McGee, CBF: A webinar approach makes sense. It can be taped and posted online. There would have to be some sector specific training as well. I think folks will want more than just a general overview.
- Roy Hoagland: I'm gun-shy at saying each sector workgroup chair will need to conduct a separate webinar.
- Norm Goulet, NVRPC: Each state will be implementing verification differently for each sector – it would get complicated for the workgroup chairs as they aren't always state-specific knowledgeable people.

DECISION: The Committee agreed with the recommendation for scheduling and the CBP partnership hosting a series of webinars. Part of the briefing materials for the upcoming basinwide BMP verification presentations to the Management Board and PSC, we will present recommendations for outreach, and specifically mention plans for scheduling a series of webinars. We will ask both the Management Board and the PSC for their feedback on using webinars as part of the larger outreach efforts.

Comment 17

ACTION: CBPO staff will make the requested correction in the revised draft framework report ensuring the dates match up correctly.

Comment 18
- Rich Batiuk: A jurisdiction's quality assurance plan doesn't need to say here's what's happening and it's all perfect—the jurisdiction can include specific commitments and description of plans for building up their capacity to increase training & certification, as an example.

ACTION: The Committee asked CBPO staff to revise the text to reflect guidance to the jurisdictions that their quality assurance plans can include commitments for continued building of capacity into the future and still be considered approvable.

Comment 19
- Andy Zemba: We've been trying to figure out how we're going to do all of this. Some we'll have to do concurrently. We've done some historic data clean up. The comment is saying that historical data should precede some other work, but from our perspective we're trying to figure how to do both concurrently.
- Rich Batiuk: The framework language is not forcing the jurisdictions to follow a single way of cleaning up their historic BMP data. It is asking that they commit to cleaning up their historic data.

- Jenn Volk, University of Delaware: Should it be spelled out that the jurisdictions have that flexibility in this section?
- Rich Batiuk: Yes, we can make it clearer in the text.
- Bill Keeling, VA DEQ: Has the Modeling Workgroup determined what the calibration period will be? That'd determine where you'd focus historical clean ups.
- Rich Batiuk: The Modeling Workgroup has not brought forth its recommendation for the calibration period yet to the WQGIT. In the meantime, the framework report does provide specific time periods on which the Watershed Technical Workgroup has recommended the jurisdictions focus on in the absence of a decision on the calibration period.
- Bill Keeling: A historic clean up during the calibration period is most time critical. Historic data post-calibration can still be corrected for inaccuracies into the future.
- Bill Angstad: If the Modeling Workgroup is planning on a calibration up to 2011 or 2013, this will definitely influence how the jurisdictions conduct their more data collections and historical data reviews. That detail doesn't belong in this document, but it's the gorilla in the room in terms of what's the calibration date, and how will the jurisdictions collect data on BMPs during and beyond the calibration time
- Bill Angstad: Land use is also an issue. If things become BMPs in the model then they are part of verification. If they remain "land use" they are not.
- Rich Batiuk: The land use topic is coming up this fall for decision by the WQGIT. There are other issues going through the partnership at the same time, and we all need to realize there's a verification implication too.

ACTION: CBPO staff will follow up with Lee Currey, MDE, and Dave Montali, WV DEP, co-chairs of the CBP Modeling Workgroup, to further discuss plans for defining the Chesapeake Bay Program Watershed Model's calibration period and raise the issues raised by the Committee.

Comment 20
- Rich Batiuk: We plan to use a 2-year period following PSC approval of the basinwide BMP verification framework for the jurisdictions to further develop/enhance their existing BMP tracking, verification and reporting programs. Then for the following round of annual progress runs following that two-year period, if reported BMP practices have not been documented in a jurisdiction's NEIEN data submission that they have been verified, they won't be given credit. Are you Committee members comfortable with this recommend 2-year ramp up period?
- Russ Baxter: If we get to the end of the 2-year period, who's to say when the PSC will act? It's fuzzy on when the clock starts ticking. The statement that NEIEN based systems won't be credited – that's a little sweeping. There may be some loose ends not finished, but on the right track. Then 2 year has ended. To get no credit if it's not 100% done is a little stronger than I'm comfortable with.
- James Davis Martin: We've been striving to maintain consistency between the Phase 6 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Model and the basinwide BMP verification framework for

the Bay TMDL Midpoint Assessment. For me it's better instead of saying we don't know when the PSC will approve it, if we put this 2 years into action for the first full progress year following the 2-year point after PSC approval. We're not going to implement this component where the BMP is dropped if it's not verified until after the 2017 Midpoint Assessment – so it really makes it 2018 when this applies.

- Bill Angstad: Fixing a 2-year drop dead date isn't realistic. We need mile posts between here and 2 years out. We won't even know until 2015 what the BMPs are that we'd have to verify for the Phase 6.0 Watershed Model. There could also be legal authority issues. The 2 years done or drop dead does not make sense. I'd suggest we set clear mile posts along the way to guide this ramp up process. Something different from only PSC approval and then 2 years out and drop dead.
- Roy: This seems to defeat the purpose of Midpoint Assessment in 2017 where we wanted to get a much more accurate picture of the BMP which have been implemented and verified as functioning on the ground.
- Beth: I understand what James is saying about dropping these things. Would the 2017 annual progress model run reflect the revamped jurisdictional BMP tracking, verification and reporting programs? If so, then that's when the changes should be incorporated.\
- Rich Batiuk: The 2017 annual progress model run would reflect the partnership-requested, jurisdictional completed historical BMP data clean ups, and jurisdictions' enhanced BMP verification elements put into operation up to that date. James is saying not to put in place an absolute cut off of all BMPs which may have been reported but not verified. He is recommending this cut off of reported but not verified BMP would not happen would not happen until the 2018 annual progress model run.
- Rich Batiuk: We're trying to keep driving implementation of the basinwide framework forward. I'm hearing, let's ensure we're building/accounting for other elements of the Midpoint Assessment and how at some point in the not too distant future, all of these need to all come together. And in a year or two we'll know what's going to be in place in this basinwide verification system based on the individual jurisdictions plans. We can take the following steps to keep us moving while working to resolve all the details looking out two plus years:
  - We can use the previously agreed to Gantt chart to map out the two year ramp of period.
  - We can build into Bill Angstadt's idea of clear mile post along the way to recognize intersections/connections with other work underway through the Midpoint Assessment.
  - We can recognize up front that as we're building new/enhancing existing BMP tracking, verification, and reporting programs and ramping them up, it's going to be difficult to verify <u>all</u> those reported BMPs by the date that the 2017 annual progress data are due to be delivered to EPA, hence the recommended focus on the 2018 annual progress data submission.
  - We can to raise this topic to the MB and PSC and active seek their feedback and decisions for how they want to proceed during this post PSC approval time period.

– We can recognize in the revised draft framework document that the specifics are still up for discussion, but this is the direction we're recommending to head.

DECISION: The Committee agreed to proceed forward to the meetings with the Management Board in mid-September and the Principals' Staff Committee (later in the fall) as described immediately above.

Comment 21
- Robin Pellicano, MDE: Everyone is on a different time schedule, so that's complicates the issue. It takes a long time to verify every historical BMP.
- Norm Goulet: We have to remember that the majority of BMPs we're getting credit for now are historical. The way the states are structured, the process of verification automatically kicks off for a new BMP the minute the plan is submitted to a local government for review. It raises the question of how historic BMPs might be downgraded through calibration?
- Mary Gattis: How do local governments even know what historic BMPs are, particularly if they're not part of an MS4? Maybe this goes to the workgroup or each state. Coming from a local government perspective, the majority probably don't even know what's been reported, so they won't know what needs to be verified.
- Rich Batiuk: Norm, do you feel workgroup guidance addresses Greg Sandi's original comment? Match up with permitting cycles. Look at this across jurisdictions, then they become jurisdiction-specific?
- Norm Goulet: Non stormwater-permitted areas are where communication between local governments and states is critical. That's why we left that flexibility in the Urban Stormwater Workgroup's BMP verification guidance so states can tailor their own programs to best match with the local governments.
- Bill Angstad: The Agriculture Workgroup has the opposite issue – as urban stormwater is faced with crediting non MS4 BMPs, agriculture has lots of non-cost-share BMPs that have never been credited. If we're going to have some course for downgrading storm water BMPs, do we need a process for upgrading non cost share, non-regulated agricultural BMPs?
- Rich Batiuk: There are a lot of implemented practices not being reported in the urban sector too. So both sector share some of the exact same challenges.

Comment 22
- Roy Hoagland: I think the proposed language is too open ended.
- Rich Batiuk: What would be more acceptable?
- Roy Hoagland: If there is that kind of flexibility, there has to be a deadline associated with it.
- Rich Batiuk: There will be a ramp up period. We need to recognize some jurisdictions can't do everything up front, but they need to communicate their commitment to moving

forward with the process to get everything into place. We need some kind of end date, but also we need to build in the time to ramp up.

- Matt Monroe, WV DoA: The proposed language looks pretty good to get the flexibility we need.

DECISION: The Committee decided to charge CBPO staff to make the proposed language changed recognizing the need to ensure there are deadlines/specific timeframes reflected in a jurisdiction's quality assurance plan for getting in place the protocols, procedures, and processes.

Comment 23:
DECISION: The Committee addressed this comment previously in comment 10.

Comment 24: LGAC
- Rich Batiuk: We will be sure to recognize in the revised draft framework report that the demands of enhancements to the jurisdictions' existing BMP tracking, verification, and reporting programs will cost money and that the partners are committed to doing all this in a cost effectiveness manner.
- James Davis Martin: There's been a tendency that when someone raises an issue of insufficient resources, we point back to the limited funds and say well that's what's available. I'm pretty sure the jurisdictions have already allocated CBRAP grants to other things. We need more funding in those pots to address issues. But that's not exclusively a federal responsibility. All are matching grants – each federal dollar is met with a state dollar.
- Mary Gattis: I think it's more about how to get that money to local governments. I hope LGAC can engage with the jurisdictions and talk about how to address this block grant program to give local governments a small pool of money. We can continue this dialogue about how to help local governments meet challenges.

DECISION: The Committee agreed it address this comment by addressing several of the prior comments as well as by the commitment to continue working with the Bay Program partners' Local Government Advisory Committee.

Committee Responses to Critical Overarching Issues Raised by Agriculture Workgroup

Revisiting the Guidance's Less than 5% Criteria issue

DECISION: The Committee was supportive of the Agriculture Workgroup's request and would address this request for a revisit as part of a larger process for implementing the framework over the coming years. [**Post Conference Call Note**: This specific issue could be included as one of the mileposts that Bill Angstadt recommend capturing in the Gannt Chart outlining the entire implementation process.]

USDA 5% Verification Cap

- Susan Marquart: I want to bring up a few things in terms of NRCS standard operating procedures. The checking and verifying we do – it's more than that 5%. When you look at how conservation practices are implemented – a technician or partner is working on practices with a farmer, however those people have supervisors and it's the supervisor's responsibility to monitor their employees. Technicians only check projects they have job approval authority to do. Because conservation districts are under us, we have to make sure they're following these methods. Those operating procedures provide additional quality assurance of verification. That 5% spot checking is only just a piece of what we do.
- Rich Batiuk: This is good as a follow through to get better communication about NRCS's processes, and that NRCS has additional verification documentation that the states can reference and people can look at how you carry all of that out and how it provides a robust verification effort.

DECISION: The Committee committed to including language committing EPA taking on the lead role for bringing the full federal family more into the verification fold on BMP verification protocols/procedures and documentation thereof.

Application of "Independent Review" Definition to Agricultural Practices
- Rich Batiuk: We will draft some revised language it up and send around as we work to revise the draft document.
- Roy Hoagland: Our recommendation was that Review Panel – not the BMP Verification Committee – should establish those definitions.

ACTION: Rich Batiuk will follow up with Dana York, BMP Verification Review Panel, about how to address this issue working with the Panel.

Next Steps
- Share the summary of conference call with Committee members.
- Take feedback from the Committee as discussed and decide during this conference call and the more detailed text edits from James Davis Martin, Russ Baxter, Denise Clearwater – and incorporate them into the revised draft document. By next Friday, send the final revised draft of the framework document out to Management Board members in preparation for their September 11th meeting, copy members of this committee and other interested parties.

ACTION: Committee members will work with their respective Management Board member to brief them prior to the September 11th meeting.

Conference Call Participants

Name	Affiliation
Bill Angstadt	DE/MD Agribusiness Association
Rich Batiuk	U.S. EPA Chesapeake Bay Program Office

Russ Baxter	Virginia Natural Resources Secretariat
Sarah Diebel	U.S. Department of Defense
Lindsay Dodd	DE/MD Agribusiness Association
Marcia Fox	Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control
Jack Frye	Chesapeake Bay Commission
Mary Gattis	Alliance for Chesapeake Bay
Norm Goulet	Northern Virginia Regional Commission
Jeremy Hanson	Chesapeake Research Consortium
Roy Hoagland	Hope Impacts LLC
Susan Marquart	U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, NRCS
James Davis Martin	Virginia Department of Environmental Quality
Beth McGee	Chesapeake Bay Foundation
Matt Monroe	West Virginia Department of Agriculture
Gary Moore	Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation
George Onyullo	District Department of Environment
Robin Pellicano	Maryland Department of the Environment
John Rhoderick	Maryland Department of Agriculture
Jeff Sweeney	U.S. EPA Chesapeake Bay Program Office
Jenn Volk	University of Delaware
Christen Wolf	Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection
Andy Zemba	Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection