CBP Goal Implementation Team
Enhance Partnering, Leadership, and Management
Meeting Minutes

Date: October 18, 2016
Time: 10:00am – 3:00pm
Location: Conference Call; Oatlands Plantation, Emmet House, 20850 Oatlands Plantation Lane, Leesburg, VA 20175
Call-in: 866-299-3188
Code: 267-985-6222
Adobe Connect Link: http://epawebconferencing.acms.com/git6/
Meeting Page: http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/23344

Members In Attendance:

Greg Allen, EPA	**Mike Foreman, VA DCR**	**Dan Nees, UMD EFC/BFWG Chair**
Greg Barranco, EPA	**Laura Free, EPA**	**Reggie Parrish, EPA**
Russ Baxter, VA Office of Natural Resources	**Emily Freeman, CRC**	**Jennifer Pauer, WV DEP**
Carin Bisland, EPA, Vice-Chair	**Mary Gattis, Alliance/LGAC**	**Kristin Saunders, UMCES**
Jessica Blackburn, Alliance (CAC Liaison)	**David Goshorn, MD DNR, Chair**	John Schneider, DE DNREC
Bevin Buchheister, CBC	**Kirk Havens, VIMS/STAC Liaison**	Doreen Vetter, EPA
Diane Davis, DC DOE	**Carl Hershner, VIMS**	**Julie Winters, EPA**
Sarah Diebel, DOD	**Nicki Kasi, PA DEP**	Kristen Wolf, PA DEP
Andy Fellows, UMD/LLWG Chair	**Sara Latessa, NY DEC**	**Jim Edward, EPA (guest)**
Kristen Fleming, MD DNR	Nicole Lehmer, CRC	**Christine Conn (guest)**
Rachel Felver, Alliance	Jackie Lendrum, NY DEC	**Christopher Wright, USGS (guest)**

Agenda Item, Discussion Lead and Desired Outcome	Time	Materials, Notes, and Action Items
Introductions (Discussion Lead: Dave Goshorn) *Welcome note and a brief history of Oatlands Plantation from Special Events Manager Moriah Lemming. Review Action Items from September meeting.*	10:00 – 10:15	**Summary of Action Items from September Meeting:** • **ACTION:** Contact Lisa Wainger before 9/15 MB meeting to include STAC in the Biennial Review development process. (*Kristin Saunders*) ***Complete.*** • **DECISION:** GIT6 agrees that Biennial Strategy Review System **Option 3** should be presented to the Management Board on September 15, 2016. ***Complete.*** • **ACTION:** Draft a matrix showing the governance of GITs, to be reviewed at the October 2016 GIT6 meeting. Solicit recommendations on whether to carry this over to workgroups, or create an alternate governance structure for workgroups. (*Carin Bisland, Emily Freeman*) ***Complete.*** • **ACTION:** Send a message to GIT Chairs to solicit comments on any issues GITs are having with voting governance. (*Kristin Saunders*) ***Complete.***

		• **ACTION:** Draft a recommended approach for each suggested revision to the Governance Document, to be reviewed at the October 2016 GIT6 meeting. (*Carin Bisland, Emily Freeman*) ***In progress.***

Goal Team Mission, Membership, and Processes (Discussion Lead: Dave Goshorn, Greg Allen) *Review the Goal Team mission and membership criteria, and discuss any potential revisions to Goal Team processes and 2017 meeting schedules.*	10:15 – 10:45	**Materials**
		 • Enhance Partnering, Leadership and Management GIT Workplan
		
		 Notes:
		 • GIT members agree that mission statement is still applicable and appropriate
		 • The Goal Team needs to develop membership criteria
		     o Written statement of how we want to include people; develop criteria to present to Management Board (MB)
		 • All GITs have different methods for membership and ways that they operate
		 • Mary Gattis (MG): We have had a conversation about this issue – can we uncover these notes and distribute as a starting point?
		 • Water Quality GIT and Urban Stormwater Workgroup have membership criteria developed; could use these as examples when developing criteria for GIT6
		 • Carin Bisland (CB): Creating the membership from which you get consensus is important; need to have the right people at the table
		     o The people we do have should be engaged and participating to the best of their ability
		 • Just over ½ of the items on the work plan are complete, and several others we have made progress on
		     o Should be looking at this document periodically to evaluate progress and barriers to completion
		 • Kristin Saunders (KS): Could the GIT6 work plan help GITs "round out" their membership so they are more diverse?
		     o Incorporate recruitment/membership development
		     o Good opportunity to reflect the diversity composition of the Watershed within the Program
		 • **ACTION:** A small team will draft a proposal for membership criteria and present to the full Goal Team (*Greg Barranco, Mary Gattis, Nicki Kasi*). ***In progress.***

Biennial Strategy Review System, Part 1 (Discussion Lead: All) *Develop details for the 2-day biennial review meeting and the quarterly MB progress session meetings, including who should attend, and guiding questions and processes for GITs to use when preparing to present to the MB.*	10:45 – 12:00	**Materials** • Biennial Strategy Review System Meeting Details **Notes:** **2-Day Biennial Review Meeting** • Andy Fellows (AF): How will local leaders be involved in the meetings? Will they be involved in the planning process; attendance; some combination?

| | | • If local leaders are invited to participate in 2-day meeting, the structure, format, and content will change |
| | | |

• If local leaders are invited to participate in 2-day meeting, the structure, format, and content will change
  o Local leaders that are involved with GITs and workgroup could be involved
• The <u>outputs</u> and <u>expectations</u> of meeting participants will help us define who should be there
• Greg Barranco (GB): It's a "State of the Bay Program Ecosystem" kind of meeting
  o Visionary – looking at trends, current science, etc.
  o Not getting into the details (e.g. outcomes) as much
    ▪ The quarterly progress session meetings are where you get into numeric level, progress on work plans, etc.
• Julie Winters (JW): Financing strategies may become of part of these discussions, but we're not sure yet how it will fit in
• Nicki Kasi (NK): If PSC is responsible for reporting to the EC, then the Biennial meeting should be led by the PSC
  o They should decide who on their Staff should be with them and advise them (e.g. GIT Chairs)
• Mike Foreman (MF): Caution your exclusivity so you don't leave out important groups
• MG: We need to be clear whether this is a <u>working</u> meeting or a <u>reporting</u> out meeting
  o Greg Allen (GA): This is a working meeting, with the report from the PSC to the EC based on the results of this meeting
• Carl Hershner (CH): Other national programs have annual meetings where they both get reports and ay out visionary ideas; with proper management, this could do that for the Bay Program
  o What is missing is a subsequent, smaller meeting focused on how to take assessment from the past 2 years and frame it as if we will be speaking to the Independent Evaluator, the EC, etc.
    ▪ What do we want to be known about the Bay Program?
• Could also do a synthesis workshop at the end of the 2-day meeting
  o MG: Could we do the synthesis as part of a GIT6 meeting?
• Rachel Felver (RF): Is this meeting a time to celebrate successes, or to address challenges?
• NK: What is meant by Program evaluation?
  o GA: External evaluations – independent evaluator, GAO, OMB, etc.

Quarterly Progress Session Meetings
• GIT6 will need to work with GIT Chairs to help them develop their materials for MB presentations

		• CH: These meetings must reflect the elements of the Decision Framework in structure and content
		  o Teams should be evaluating in the same order as the Decision Framework
		• GB: Templates could be a way to use ChesapeakeStat (ChesapeakeDecisons)
		• Need a column for "inputs" to determine what kind of information we need for each meeting
		  o Information is an input, conclusions are outputs
		• CH: Need to know if factors influencing have changed; where our gaps are; and if our actions are leading to expected responses
		• **ACTION:** Draft revised Objectives, Inputs, Outputs, and Guiding Questions for the 2-day Biennial Review meeting. Distribute to the Goal Team by Friday, October 21, 2016. Goal Team members should review and submit comments before the November 1, 2016 GIT6 meeting (*Dave Goshorn*). **Complete.**
		• **ACTION:** Draft revised Objectives, Inputs, Outputs, and Guiding Questions for the Quarterly Progress Session meetings to reflect the adaptive management Decision Framework. Send to the Goal Team for review and comment by Friday, October 21, 2016 (*Kirk Havens, Carl Hershner*). **Complete.**

Lunch *Lunch will be provided by Virginia, and will be catered by Hill High Bakery & BBQ Company.*	12:00 – 12:30	

Biennial Strategy Review System, Part 2 (Discussion Lead: All)
Review the sequence and timing of meeting theme (indicator) groups, and draft a mock agenda for the first 2-day biennial review meeting and the first MB quarterly progress session.
	12:30 – 1:30	**Materials**
		• Biennial Strategy Review System Summary
		
		Notes:
		Theme Placement & Groupings (quarterly progress session meetings)
		• Groupings are aimed at breaking people out of GIT circles, and to reflect how outcomes/goals interact with one another
		• Tree canopy may be better in urban setting (e.g. Toxics), versus in Healthy Watersheds
		  o Could move Forest Buffers into Healthy Watersheds
		• GB: should be considering climate resiliency and diversity in all of these meetings, as well as its own discrete topics
		  o Have a separate "cross-cutting" template for Climate and Diversity
		• "Change & Resiliency" → move Land Use Methods & Metrics in this box
		• MG: Try and concentrate land use topics in one meeting
		  o Changes in land use affect many outcomes, etc.
		• Water Quality placement is tied to 2-Year Milestones
		• NK: How does it fit with the Phase III WIP and Midpoint Assessment?

		o Are 2-year milestones most important time for WQGIT to be in front of MB? **Next Steps** • October 19 – November 1 (next GIT6 meeting): o Refine meeting details • November 1 – November 17 (next MB meeting): o Figure out "what these meetings look like on the ground" ▪ Templates, agendas, guiding questions • Review the theme groupings/placement with GIT Coordinators to get their input • Laura Free (LF): We want to prepare fewer materials to send out to GITs before meetings o Do we want this first 2-day Biennial Review meeting to be a "State of the Program" meeting? ▪ Or wait until the 2-day meeting in January 2019? o Is there more value in using January 2017 meeting as a kickoff? • MG: We could use the first 2-day meeting as a teaching process/trial run o Get people up to speed on working through the Decision Framework • CB: There is lack of understanding around the work plans, and when/how they're updated o Are work plans updated at quarterly meetings? At the 2-day meeting? • Work plans should be updated **as a result** of progress sessions with the MB, but not only at this time o GB: If you are only doing review of work plans for these quarterly meetings, it will be 2 years in between status reports ▪ Would like to know where progress is at some point in between ▪ Teams can give periodic progress updates/reports without having to redo the work plans • **ACTION:** Laura Free will lead a small group in revising the progress session theme groupings and placement on the Biennial timeline. A revised model will be presented to GIT members and GIT Coordinators and Staffers for review and input (*Laura Free, Dave Goshorn, Carin Bisland, Greg Allen, Greg Barranco, Kristin Saunders, Doreen Vetter, Emily Freeman*). ***In progress.***
GIT6 Workgroup Activities, Opportunities, and Challenges (Discussion Lead: Dan Nees, Andy Fellows) *Workgroup Chairs will lead discussion on the status of current projects; future planned activities and deliverables; ideas for workgroup participation in the Biennial Strategy Review System; and opportunities for GIT6-Workgroup collaboration to overcome*	1:30 – 2:30	**Materials** • Budget and Finance Workgroup Charge • 2016-2017 Budget and Finance Workgroup work plan (Draft) • Budget and Finance Small Team Charge • Local Leadership Update **Notes:**

barriers workgroups may be facing.		**Budget & Finance Workgroup**
		• This workgroup is aiming to look both inside and outside of the Program to fulfill the actions in their Charge/Work Plan
		• We will be advising GITs on how their programs and actions point to broader financing goals and opportunities in Bay restoration efforts
		• Still recruiting members
		   ○ Have great representation on budget issues, but very limited in finance expertise
		      ▪ 2-3 more finance experts within the jurisdictions would be ideal
		• The Environmental Finance Symposium Report Action Team is not within the workgroup or Goal Team 6
		   ○ The Action Team will report directly to MB with recommendations
		• The Action Team response will determine who has responsibility for implementing the recommendations, time frames, internal/external, etc.
		• LGAC will also be providing recommendations, using low-medium-high priority for each Symposium recommendation
		• Jim Edward (JE): The long-term work may not be done by the Action Team, but coordinated by B&FWG as a whole
		• NK: The PSC should set the direction for the Action Team to consider recommendations in priority order
		   ○ Because ultimately the PSC is responsible for owning this report
		• Working on developing actions within the B&FWG work plan around the Biennial SRS timeline
		   ○ Primarily pertains for putting down "markers" to do finance strategies
		Local Leadership Workgroup
		• One of the major objectives for this workgroup is getting local elected officials up to speed
		• Local leadership should be engaged in the 2-day biennial review meeting
		   ○ CB: 2-day meeting is similar audience as PSC meeting; if we are synthesizing information for EC, we can do something similar for local leaders
		• Locals' Staff may be more actively engaged in planning functions/phases
		   ○ Get them involved into the decision making process
		• There are a number of existing forums that the LLWG/EcoLogix will be piggy-backing on to survey local officials (e.g. VA Roundtable)
		• Do GIT6 and/or jurisdictional members want specific roles and/or actions as part of this planned outreach?
		• MF: in VA, soil and water conservation districts are an interesting entity
		   ○ Locally elected, not paid; they have connections to local governments that

		few other groups would have

		o There is an annual meeting (usually in Dec.) that we could look into
		• EcoLogix and LLWG are confident that with a variety of approaches, we will get a lot of input from local officials
		• At December workgroup meeting, have discussion around how different elected officials will play different roles at the quarterly MB progress meetings
		   o The structure and timing of these meetings will allow people to know which meetings they do/do not need or want to be involved in
		       ▪ Ex. With the topic of Land Use, local elected officials will likely want to be involved
		• The workgroup is seeking additional members from DC, WV, DE, and NU

CBP Governance Document (Discussion Lead: Kristin Saunders)
Review log of revisions with associated next steps and recommendations. Reach consensus on which recommendations to take to the Management Board.
	2:30 – 2:50	**Materials**
		• Governance Document log of revisions (Draft)
		• GIT-Workgroup Governance Matrix (Draft)
		• CBP Governance Document
		
		Notes:
		• Kristin has checked in with GIT Chairs on decision making and any issues they are having
		   o Most GITs are not having issues
		• Participation among members is the biggest issue they are having
		• Have not yet gotten MB approval on the issues in the Governance Document log of revisions
		• GIT6 needs to update the document **and** look at Governance as a broader issue
		• NK: Include the Biennial timeline in the Governance Document; could use it as a framework for updates to the Governance Document
		   o GA: The "roles and responsibilities" will be informed by theme timeline
		• Include the Communications Workgroup into the discussion on Governance
		• Full discussion on this topic moved to a future meeting

Action Items, Wrap-up, Next Meeting (Discussion Lead: Dave Goshorn, Emily Freeman) *Review current GIT workplan and discuss potential revisions resulting from new processes and/or focus areas. Review action items and discuss details for the upcoming meeting.*	2:50 – 3:00	**Materials** • Enhance Partnering, Leadership and Management GIT Workplan **Next Meeting:** Tuesday, November 1, 1-3PM • **ACTION:** A small team will draft a proposal for membership criteria and present to the full Goal Team (*Greg Barranco, Mary Gattis, Nicki Kasi*). ***In progress.*** • **ACTION:** Draft revised Objectives, Inputs, Outputs, and Guiding Questions for the 2-day Biennial Review meeting. Distribute to the Goal Team by Friday, October

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>

21, 2016. Goal Team members should review and submit comments before the November 1, 2016 GIT6 meeting (*Dave Goshorn*). **Complete.**

- **ACTION:** Draft revised Objectives, Inputs, Outputs, and Guiding Questions for the Quarterly Progress Session meetings to reflect the adaptive management Decision Framework. Send to the Goal Team for review and comment by Friday, October 21, 2016 (*Kirk Havens, Carl Hershner*). **Complete.**
- **ACTION:** Laura Free will lead a small group in revising the progress session theme groupings and placement on the Biennial timeline. A revised model will be presented to GIT members and GIT Coordinators and Staffers for review and input (*Laura Free, Dave Goshorn, Carin Bisland, Greg Allen, Greg Barranco, Kristin Saunders, Doreen Vetter, Emily Freeman*). **In progress.**

</td>
</tr>
</table>