
CAC Members Present: Bill Achor, Paul Bruder, John Dawes (Thurs.), Andrew Der, Jim Elliott, Greg Evans, Christy Everett, Verna Harrison (Thurs.), Jeff Holland, Joe Maroon, Karen McJunkin, Jennifer Reed-Harry, Charlie Stek, Victor Ukpolo (Thurs.), Neil Wilkie and staff- Jessica Blackburn and Amy Robins

Guests: Matt Ellis (STAC staff), Mary Gattis (LGAC staff), Michael Helfrich (Thurs.), Rhonda Manning (PA DEP), All Todd (Alliance)(Thurs.)

Meeting presentations and materials are located:

<http://www.chesapeakebay.net/S=0/calendar/event/21404/>

Thursday February 27, 2013

CAC Chair John Dawes called the meeting to order at 11:00pm. CAC members and guests introduced themselves.

Maryland Updates

Joseph Gill, Secretary, MD Natural Resources

Frank Dawson, Deputy Secretary, MD Natural Resources

Secretary Gill explained that the seven goals (Sustainable Fisheries, Wetland Habitats, Water Quality, Healthy Watersheds, Land Conservation, Bay Access, and Environmental Literacy) in the new Bay Agreement provide the public with a story that can easily be told. Secretary Gill and Deputy Secretary Dawson spoke individually to all of the jurisdictions about their intentions with the new Bay Agreement. Overall, they received a favorable response from the jurisdictions with most pointing out they already implement several of the proposed goals. Some jurisdictions expressed concern of the unknown since the management strategies are still being developed. Secretary Gill pointed out that agreement is still voluntary but they would like to see some accountability with Maryland. Secretary Gill said he thought there is still a possibility that there could be new goals since toxics and climate change were heavily supported during the public comment period. Deputy Secretary Dawson briefly responded to questions regarding Conowingo Dam and the 2014 relicensing. He referenced a new study what will go out for public comment mid-July-August. Deputy Secretary Dawson reviewed several key environmental bills that were in Maryland Legislation.

Chesapeake Bay Program (CBP) Updates

Jim Edward, Deputy Director, EPA Chesapeake Bay Program

Every five years CBP is required by the Clean Water Act to submit a report to Congress on the Status and Trends of the Chesapeake Bay Ecosystem, Management Strategies Effectiveness, Recommendations for Improved Management and a conclusion. He also reviewed past, current and future funding for the Chesapeake Bay Program. The Bay Program received an increase from \$54 million to \$70 million for the FY2014 budget. He stated almost 80% of the increase is going to the state grants. Other investment areas include Goal Implementation Team support, BMP Expert Panels and Verification Programs, CAST/FAST (Chesapeake/Federal Assessment Scenario Tools), Climate Change, Citizen Monitoring Initiative and Trading Program Support. NRCS's budget dropped from \$98 to \$51 due to the Farm Bill expiring. Jim

reviewed comments on the watershed agreement; toxics contamination is the topic that received the most comments. The Issues Resolution Committee will address the public comments and are taking the comments seriously.

Environmental Education in Baltimore

John Pickering, Living Classrooms Foundation

Living Classrooms Foundation has provided unique hands-on, interdisciplinary and environmental education programs aboard historic ships and on land since 1985. These dynamic, "learning by doing" programs emphasize applied learning in math, science, social studies, language arts, and social skills.

The programs serve students from a variety of backgrounds and economic means and range in length from one-day expeditions for school and youth groups to extended shipboard and land/sea programs. Participants see how academic skills are used in the real world. Leadership and teamwork are key objectives as students work together to raise and lower sails, trawl for marine life, perform scientific tests, and explore the commerce, history, natural resources, and ecosystems of the Chesapeake Bay. Living Classrooms shipboard education programs serve thousands of students per year from throughout the region aboard the Foundation's floating classrooms. More information can be found: www.livingclassrooms.org

Captain Jamie Trost, Pride of Baltimore

Pride of Baltimore, Inc. is a non-profit maritime institution dedicated to preserving and enhancing the living history of the Chesapeake Bay through education in the traditional practices of seamanship and nautical craft via hands-on exploration aboard *Pride of Baltimore II*, a historically evocative reproduction of a War of 1812-era privateer. Capturing public imagination through unique worldwide voyages of discovery, *Pride II* honors Maryland seafarers of all eras and, wherever she sails, shares the innovation, entrepreneurial spirit, and patriotism that forged and continues to define Maryland's maritime identity.

New Insights Report

Bill Dennison, VP for Science Applications, University of Maryland Center for Environmental Studies

The report, *New Insights: Science Based Evidence of Water Quality Improvements, Challenges and Opportunities in the Chesapeake* is available online at <http://ian.umces.edu/blog/2014/03/04/new-insights-report-converting-geeky-science-into-understandable-stories/> The report is a collaboration of the Chesapeake Bay Program, USGS and the University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science. The report is a review of over 40 case studies of research that evaluated best management practice effectiveness using water quality monitoring data. Seven over-arching lessons were extracted that could be used to guide water quality managers in future efforts to improve the health of the Bay. Lessons are organized into three broad categories: What is Working; Challenges; and Opportunities.

The First Lesson is that wastewater treatment plant upgrades work. The Second Lesson is that reductions in nitrogen oxide emissions have resulted in decreases in the atmospheric deposition of nitrogen. The Third Lesson, focused on three major practices: cover crops, livestock exclusion, and animal waste management. Cases studies show cover crops decreased nitrate concentrations in groundwater.

“Challenges” represented in the Fourth Lesson addresses the delays or “lag time” in water quality improvements despite reductions in nutrient loads, which can be a result of groundwater age and sediment storage of phosphorus. This can present a significant challenge in knowing how effective a best management practice is when we are not going to see actual results for years ahead. Lesson Five states that some practices reduce nutrient and lead to water quality improvements, however, the BMPs that would have expected to be effective may be counteracted by the changes in nutrient sources and land-use practices. For example, the increases in concentrated agricultural activities and increasing population growth triggering urban land use changes.

“Opportunities” represented in the Sixth Lesson include the need to identify all nutrient pollution sources and targeting BMPs to each source is required to reach water quality goals. For example, if nutrient runoff from farms is the dominant source of nutrients, solely upgrading wastewater treatment plants will not result in the load reductions needed to see improvements. Cover crops, waste management, and other agriculture practices will need to be implemented as well.

The last lesson addresses the Chesapeake Bay watershed’s growing population and expanding development. Stormwater runoff is a significant contributor to pollution in urban and suburban areas. The population of the Chesapeake Bay watershed is currently 17.5 million, and is projected to reach 20 million in the year 2030. As urban and suburban development expands, stormwater management becomes increasingly important. The need for proven and innovative practices to counteract the consequences to water quality must continue to be monitored to track progress and implement adaptive management as new data becomes available.

History of the Bay Agreements: Perspectives from the Chesapeake Bay Commission

Ann Swanson, Executive Director, Chesapeake Bay Commission

Ann provided an overview of the past Chesapeake Bay Agreements highlighting important state legislation in Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania that resulted from each agreement.

The Chesapeake Bay Commission (CBC) is continuing to engage in the discussion with the other Bay Program partners about the content of the new agreement. They believe Toxics, Climate Change, the Conowingo Dam and Governance are currently missing from the draft. They question whether rules of engagement are clearly defined; how the goals and outcomes will change in response to changing environmental, cultural and economic conditions; how local governments will be effectively engaged; and if new levels of transparency and verification will be hallmarks of this agreement. The CBC priorities for 2014 are Stormwater (financing, turf, MS4, financial support); Agriculture (manure, the 2014 Farm Bill’s Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) that is replacing the 2008 Farm Bill’s Chesapeake Bay Watershed Initiative, financial support, certainty); Accountability (verification/tracking, BMP Approval, offsets); and Natural Landscapes (TMDL, acquisition).

CAC Business Meeting

The December 2013 minutes were approved as submitted on motion by Charlie Stek and seconded by Neil Wilkie.

Victor Ukpolo presented a hand out regarding Environmental Literacy as a potential CAC priority for 2014. He suggested several possible presentations including: Current levels of minority participation on Bay campaigns (Volunteerism, Grass Root Campaigns, Support from Minority or Majority Serving Civic Leaders) and an Overview of Environmental Justice Hot Topics in the Bay. He cited specific outcomes (ideas): community boards, funding requirements, joint policy making boards, and community impact statements.

Christy Everett (VA) and Jennifer Reed-Harry (PA) reviewed legislative briefings from their state. Maryland was covered by Frank Dawson earlier in the day.

Friday, February 28, 2014

The meeting was called to order by Vice Chair, Charlie Stek at 8:00am.

Members watched a Chesapeake Bay Program Public Service Announcement (PSA):

What Does it Take to Restore and Protect the Chesapeake Bay. Here is a link to the [Video](#). CAC members are encouraged to download the video and share it with their colleagues.

CAC Member Presentations and Discussion on potential CAC 2014 priorities

The following potential future meeting topics were elaborated on by CAC members: Farm Bill Presentation, Communications, Stormwater, Innovation of BMPs, MS4 permit renewals, Fracking, Toxics, Emerging Threats, Nutrient Trading, Conowingo Dam, Forestry, Public Access, Land Conservation, and Oysters.

Member stressed the importance of having speakers provide all perspectives on any given issues.

Neil Wilkie suggested CAC focus on supporting current communications effort such as the CBP's PSA through business and personal means. Jeff Holland seconded that suggestion.

Christy Everett and Karen McJunkin both felt that since the stormwater sector is growing in pollution that it should be a CAC priority. They cited possible presentations featuring: innovation of BMPs, LID Green Infrastructure, MS4 permit renewals, expert panels, Public/Private partnerships, needed technical assistance, dual benefits and citizen involvement as potential topics for speakers in 2014. The following CAC members volunteered to form a Stormwater Subcommittee: Christy Everett, Karen McJunkin, Paul Bruder, Joe Maroon, and possibly Andrew Der.

Joe Maroon asked that CAC members remain focused on what may be left out of the new Bay Agreement. Highlighting fracking, emerging issues, nutrient trading, toxics and climate change.

Greg Evans provided a handout on Riparian Forest Buffers. He pointed out that natural landscapes remaining natural should be getting credit in the Bay TMDL and is currently not. He also highlighted implementation barriers such as technical assistance, new innovation and lack of baseline knowledge. The following CAC members volunteered to form a Forestry Subcommittee: Greg Evans, Jennifer Reed-Harry, and possibly Matt Ehrhart.

Principals' Staff Committee Conference Call

CAC Members participated in the PSC conference call from 10:00-11:15am for the continued discussion on the Bay Agreement.

CAC Members reconvened the discussion on potential CAC 2014 priorities

Charlie Stek suggested CAC focus on those agencies that are not participating and what resources they can bring to the table. He highlighted funding, regulation with enforcement, and engaging educated citizens. He pointed to the latter as being a gap that needs to be closed- the disconnection between public schools, environmental education and those that can and cannot afford it. There needs to be a connection to the underserved communities through proper communication means. A possible opportunity is with the newly appointed Secretary of Education, Ann Holden. The following CAC members volunteered to form an Environmental Education Subcommittee: Andrew Der, Neil Wilkie, Charlie Stek, Victor Ukpolo, Jeff Holland, and potentially Dan Milstein.

CAC Members discussed spending time break into subcommittees during the May 2014 meeting.

With no further business the meeting adjourned at 12:00pm.