**ATTENDANCE:**

* Carl Hershner
* Greg Barranco
* Nita Sylvester
* Carin Bisland
* Tim Wilke
* Scott Phillips
* Scott Schill
* Doreen Vetter
* Lucinda Power

**ACTION:**

**DUE 6/22/12: GIT mentors will provide to Carl by next Friday (6/22/12) the answers the following questions for each of your GIT's "preliminary goal statements"** [**(Attachment II.b) GIT Goal Statements - with goals outcomes)**](http://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/18083/%28attachment_ii.b%29_git_goal_statements_mb_6-13-12_with_goals_outcomes.xlsx)**.**

1. "Is the Goal Statement Clear?" In answering this question, consider the Decision Framework guidance for articulating program goals. Key characteristics:
	* The goal statement should identify a measurable outcome.
	* Preferably it should be realistic and attainable within a practical time period. (But there is no reason it cannot be aspirational.)
	* The key is that it must be explicit. Terms like “healthy” or “sustainable” or “natural” are open to endless debate, and therefore not particularly useful in goal statements. If they are used, it is essential that there be an accompanying statement that defines them in terms of measurable parameters. For example, “clean” waters might be defined as those meeting all water quality standards, “natural” conditions might be defined as specific parameters matching those in a particular reference site. The goal statement should be sufficiently explicit, or well enough defined, that anyone reading it would have no doubt about what the aspiration is.
2. "Is it important to my jurisdiction/fed agency/advisory committee and how? (e.g. jurisdictional priority, EC commitment, EO outcome)."
	* In answering this question, consider listing the jurisdiction(s)/fed agency(ies)/advisory committee(s) to which you believe it should be important.
3. "Is it more easily achieved through partner collaboration? (Does it require multiple partner collaboration/commitment or would it benefit from exchange of information?)" In answering this question, consider the following:
	* Does achievement of the goal require collaboration across GITs (if so, which ones)
	* Does achievement of the goal require collaboration among multiple CBP partners at the MB, PSC and/or EC level (if so, which jurisdictional agencies and/or federal agencies)
	* OR is collaboration among multiple partners within the GIT sufficient (no need for collaboration at the MB, PSC and/or EC level)
	* OR is there no need for collaboration (e.g. goal can be achieved entirely by one partner).

**SUMMARY**

* Meeting Materials available at mtg webpage: <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/18402/>
* Approved [summary of 5/18/12 DFIW mtg](http://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/18328/dfiw_mtg_summary_051812.docx)
* Discussed follow-up from 5/9/12 and 6/13/12 Management Board mtgs. Refer to action items from those mtgs
	+ [http://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel\_files/18083/(attachment\_i.a)\_mb\_actions\_decisions\_5-9-12f.docx](http://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/18083/%28attachment_i.a%29_mb_actions_decisions_5-9-12f.docx) and
	+ <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/18403/mb_actions-decisions_6-13-12.docx>
* Discussed updates from CAC and LGAC mtgs. Nita asked about the following statement in the [CAC Future CBP Goal Recommendations Development](http://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/18402/cac_future_cbp_goal_recommendation_development.docx) document, provided for the CAC mtg: “The CBP Principal Staff Committee intends to move toward development of a new CBP agreement in 2013.” Carin clarified that the PSC expectation remains the same and therefore, Stage 2 of the “alignment” process needs to be completed by Dec 31, 2012 and immediately after that, the CBP needs to decide if Stage 3 needs to be implemented in order to prepare a new agreement for the 2013 EC mtg (refer to “[Coordinating Chesapeake Bay Program and Federal Leadership Committee Goals, Outcomes and Action](http://archive.chesapeakebay.net/pubs/calendar/47751_09-22-11_Handout_1_11488.pdf)”). The PSC has not been informed that there will be any delays in this process, so we need to proceed as scheduled, pending any revised guidance from the PSC.
* Discussed plan of action to start work on the current goal statements (e.g. take a pass at assessing them based on the DF guidance and provide suggestions for improvements/alternatives). Carl asked the DFIW GIT mentors to answer the questions related to GIT goal statements that were provided to the MB on 6/13/12 (refer to [http://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel\_files/18083/(attachment\_ii.a)\_git\_goal\_statements\_(overview).docx)](http://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/18083/%28attachment_ii.a%29_git_goal_statements_%28overview%29.docx%29). Refer to the action item above for details.
* Scott updated the DFIW on the recent mtg of the WQGIT, at which they discussed the DF documentation for their overarching goal. The updated documentation is available at <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/18402/applying_the_decision_framework_to_the_bay_tmdl_draft___june_5_latest_version.docx>.