**Agenda and Discussion Items for Call on Helping Water-Quality Goal Team Implement the CBP Decision Framework, Feb 8, 11am-12:30**

Purpose of Call: Discuss best approach to have Water-Quality Goal Team and its workgroup use and implement the CBP Decision Framework. Scott Phillips and Greg Allen are facilitators to the WQ GIT to help with use of the CBP Decision Framework.

Agenda and discussion items:

1. **Discuss current use of decision framework steps by the WQ GIT and identify areas of emphasis.**

The WQ GIT already has used many aspects of the CBP decision framework in developing the TMDL. We will discuss what is already in place so we can decide where to focus most of our effort. Some of the existing efforts of the WQ GIT and the relation to CBP decision framework include:

**Articulate Program Goals:** The emphasis of the WQ GIT is to implement the Watershed Implementation Plans to achieve the TMDL and meet water-quality standards in the Bay. Other considerations include:

* EO outcome for water quality (implement practices by 2025 and achieve standards in 60 percent of segments in the Bay. This is slightly different that the TMDL outcome of making sure all practices are in place. Do we want to address this as part of framework discussion?
* Developing toxic outcomes in 2013 and reduction strategies by 2015. This is a future need based on Toxic Contaminant report to be released in Nov. 2012. We probably do not want to address this until 2013.
* Stream health outcome in the EO. How do we engage the Goal Team on this issue?

**Describe factors influencing goal attainment:** The current understanding has focused on factors affecting nutrient and sediment that are simulated in the watershed model. Other considerations for discussion include how jurisdictions are addressing:

* Capacity to implement practices (funding, authorities, sustainability)
* Effectiveness of practices (variation of effectiveness due to variations in watershed properties, decline/change in performance over time, population growth, and climate change impacts)

**Assess current management efforts (and gaps):** Are these items described adequately in the WIPs?

**Develop Management Strategy:** We assume this is being addressed by the WIPs.

**Develop Monitoring Program.** We currently have monitoring programs to:

* Report water-quality practices being implemented
* Measure changes in nutrients and sediment in the watersheds
* Measure attainment of standards in the estuary

We should define any gaps in the associated monitoring programs and improvements that are needed to better assess progress toward the TMDL and associated 2-year milestones.

**Assess performance:** This is an area of potential improvement to help the WQ Goal Team. We have more opportunities summarize and learn what practices are most improving water quality and what we need to do better. The results from the planned report on “summary existing water-quality studies” would be one example of new information to assess performance.

**Manage Adaptively:** The 2-year milestones provide an ideal opportunity to use new information so jurisdictions can improve implementation of water-quality practices. We should discuss the types of information that would provide a the greatest benefit to the jurisdictions and EPA.

1. **Discuss best approaches for engaging the WQ GIT to apply the decision framework.**

Options to discuss include:

* Plan a face-to-face meeting with the entire WQ GIT to go through the framework (March or April?)
* Work with selected workgroups (the agricultural workgroup has already applied the framework and put material into ChesapeakeStat. The point source workgroup has an interest in using the framework.
* Other?

1. **Translating outcomes from the decision framework into ChesapeakeStat**

Discuss how to have adequate support in the decision framework discussion to draft information into content for ChesapeakeStat.

1. **Next Steps**