

**Principals Staff Committee Meeting
Actions and Decisions
December 13, 2016**

Members Present:

Molly Ward, VA Sec. NR
Pat McDonnell, PA DEP
Gayle Barry, USDA
Chuck Hunt, NPS
David Small, DE DNREC
Ben Grumbles, MDE
Ann Swanson, CBC
Shawn Garvin, EPA
Nick DiPasquale, EPA
Mark Belton, MDDNR
Hamid Karimi, DC
Charlie Stek, CAC

Alternates Representing:

Susan Conner, USACE- Balt.
Heather Cisar, USACE- Norf.
Sandy Hertz, MDOT
Peyton Robertson, NOAA
Mike Slattery, USFWS
Bruce Williams, LGAC
Scott Phillips, USGS
Teresa Koon, WV DEP

Rachel Dixon, STAC
Sam Towell, VA Ag & Forest
Scott Mandirola, WV DEP
Jason Dubow, MDDEP
Jackie Lendrum, NY DEC

Alternates Present:

Dana Aunkst, PA
Nicki Kasi, PA
Ann Jennings, CBC
Mary Gattis, LGAC
Diane Davis, DC
Jessica Blackburn, CAC
Christophe Tulou, EPA
Russ Baxter, VA
Tim Garcia, NRCS
Lee Currey, MDE

Others:

Joan Smedinghoff, CRC
Chip Macleod, CCC
Cecil Rodriguez, EPA

Al Todd, AFB
Aris Evia
Joan Salvati
Lucinda Power, EPA
Kristen Saunders, UMCES
Emile Franke, NOAA
Peggy Sanders, CBF
Joe Wood, CBF
Karl Blankenship, Bay Journal
Brian Hamilton, EPA
Nicole Lehmer, CRC
Emily Freeman, CRC
Greg Barranco, EPA
Elaine Hinrichs, STAC
Zoe Johnson, NOAA
Dave Goshorn, MD DNR
Rich Batiuk, EPA
Julie Winters, EPA
James Davis-Martin, VA
Tanya Spano, MWCOG
Tom Wenz, EPA

Actions and Decisions

Welcome and Introductions

Decision: Member plans for developing public service announcements, as indicated in the EC resolution, will be brought up at the next PSC meeting.

Action: The Principals' Staff Committee (PSC) concurs with the actions and decisions from the October 2016 meeting.

Action: Any conflicts with the 2017 MB/PSC meeting calendar should be sent to Nicole Lehmer.

Phase III WIP Planning Targets Methodology

Decision: The PSC approved the general methodology for developing Phase III WIP Planning Targets recognizing there will be specific decisions needed along the way during 2017. The recommended methodology includes a continuation of the past practice of allowing for special cases and consideration of special circumstances.

Decision: The PSC will revisit the discussion about the methodology during the planned PSC retreat (May 2017) to make final decisions on the final details of the methodology including

approving any special cases or special circumstances. An interactive briefing of the methodology planning will also be part of the retreat.

Allocation of Conowingo Infill of Nutrient and Sediment Loads

Decision: The PSC confirmed the members support:

- Continuing ongoing work on the described evaluations supporting the making of a decision on who is responsible for additional load reductions, with an emphasis on working towards narrowing down the ranges within each of the options and providing information on how the total reductions compared with E3 levels of reduction; and
- Evaluating how the additional loading responsibility will be assigned through consideration of both the application of the partnership's existing allocation equity rules as well as looking at allocations based on the most cost effective practices and locations for implementing those practices.

Narrowing Down the Range of Options for Accounting for Climate Change in the Phase III WIPs

Decision: The PSC agreed on the proposed climate change assessment procedures for determining the projected mid-term (2025) and long term (2050) impacts on the Chesapeake Bay watershed loads and the Chesapeake Bay water quality.

Action: The CBP climate coordinator, Zoe Johnson, will schedule a follow-up conference call with the appropriate Corps. of Engineers, Climate Resiliency Workgroup, and the Modeling Workgroup representatives to work out the details to ensure there is consistency between the climate change assessment work on the Comprehensive CB Plan and the MPA.

Decision: the PSC agreed on the proposed guiding principles to be considered by the jurisdictions during the development of their Phase III WIPs.

Decision: The PSC agreed to narrow the number of options to two. First, the PSC agreed with the language proposed by the Chesapeake Bay Commission combining options 5, 6, and 7. Second, the PSC also agreed to continue to work together between now and the May 2017 PSC retreat to evaluate how Option 2 will play out, based on additional modeling results as they become available.

Local Area Planning Goals Task Force's Preliminary Recommendations

Decision: The Principals' Staff Committee agreed that the Local Area Planning Goals Task Force's final recommendations will be incorporated into EPA's January 2017 Phase III WIP expectations document.

EPA's Phase III WIP Expectations – Shawn Garvin, EPA

Decision: The Principals' Staff Committee acknowledged:

- 1) EPA's plans and schedule for seeking PSC review of the draft final Phase III WIP expectations document prior to publishing the final expectations document by January 16, 2016;
- 2) The reasons behind the requested change in the schedule; and
- 3) EPA's commitment to append forthcoming Phase III WIP relevant Partnership decisions over the coming months to the final January 2017 expectations document.

Action: EPA will distribute the draft final Phase III WIP expectations document to Principals' Staff Committee members by Friday, December 16, 2016. PSC members are asked to provide comments addressing any significant concerns they have with the stated expectations by Wednesday, January 4, 2017. EPA will then publically distribute the final Phase III WIP expectations document by January 16, 2017.

Environmental Finance Symposium – MB Charge to Action Team

Note: PSC members were asked to fill out the recommendations matrix for the PSC's top priorities. PSC members asked to be kept well-informed.

Note: The top priorities were identified as: Theme Recommendation #3, Core Recommendation #1, and Theme Recommendation #1. Theme Recommendation #3 and Core Recommendation #1 should be merged into one recommendation to be addressed simultaneously. Action Team members can go back to the other recommendations at a later time, if necessary.

Decision: The Action Team should complete the recommendations matrix for these 2 recommendations (Core Recommendation #1/Theme Recommendation #3 [being merged into one] and Theme Recommendation #1) and keep PSC well-informed.

Continuing Efforts to Engage State Depts. of Education Leaders

Action: Executive Council Chair Governor McAuliffe will send a letter to other Bay Watershed Governors asking them to support *The Every Student Succeeds Act* and to pursue the available funding for environmental literacy programs. The Executive Council will discuss the Act and any Environmental Literacy items at their 2017 meeting.

PSC Role in CBP Strategy Review System (SRS)

Decision: GIT 6 Chair Dave Goshorn will add language to SRS regarding the role of PSC. The language will clarify that the flow of information is a two-way street and not only information being rolled up to the PSC from the Management Board (MB). The language will also explicitly state that input and feedback received from the PSC will be disseminated down to the MB, GITs, and other appropriate groups.

Meeting Discussion

Welcome and Introductions – Molly Ward, PSC Chair

Decision: Member plans for developing public service announcements, as indicated in the EC resolution, will be brought up at the next PSC meeting.

Action: The Principals' Staff Committee (PSC) concurs with the actions and decisions from the October 2016 meeting.

Action: Any conflicts with the 2017 MB/PSC meeting calendar should be sent to Nicole Lehmer.

Phase III WIP Planning Targets Methodology – James Davis Martin, WQGIT Chair

Russ Baxter, VA Office of the Secretary for Natural Resources: what is the relationship of planning targets and the TMDL? Given the fact that the numbers are derived from the model they're going to be different than the numbers we have today. Especially with the numbers for the Conowingo because there wasn't a number assigned yet. Want to make sure we understand, when we issue the planning target, are they going to be issued to achieve the new numbers or previous numbers issued by the TMDL?

Shawn Garvin, EPA: the purpose of the midpoint assessment was to take stock of where we are, where we are in the allocation, make assessment in what needs to be done in phase 3, are the assessments correct and are they getting us where we need to go. The new tool being put together, the phase 6 model version, one thing we focused on is that we want to create a tool to take the changes in the input. Looking at where we are, we're looking to move forward in what those numbers should be to get us to 2025 in relationship with what we know so far. We expected at one point that Conowingo would have to be accounted for.

Russ Baxter: wastewater treatments plants and MS4 facilities, if the planning targets are something different than what's in the TMDL, what legal responsibilities do they have if the TMDL can't be changed?

Shawn Garvin: if the allocation has changed, decisions will have to be made at the state level. Some of that might be revisiting waste water treatment plants or MS4s. we now have 6 years of looking to see how things translate to the ground and see if things are better or not. Those adjustments will have to be made.

James Davis-Martin, VA Dept. of Env. Quality/ Water Quality Chair: are you asking that the TMDL would be changed?

Nick DiPasquale, EPA CBPO: most of these things will require more effort.

James Davis Martin: this is the methodology to plan those planning targets, Russ's question is valid when the TMDL restrains permits. If the state basin targets are different than the state basin sum of the TMDLs then you'll know something will need to change.

Ann Swanson, Chesapeake Bay Commission: given we've used that for the WIP 1 and WIP development I suggest continuing to use it. The people involved now, were not there when that methodology was discussed. There's a difference there, the way the methodology was developed, it allowed the PSC members to understand the planning. Suggest we take the time to be briefed in an interactive way to understand.

Molly Ward, PSC Chair: yes, on both of James questions presented

Scott Mandirola, WV Dept. of Env. Protection: just want to restate that the headwater states retain some allowances

Decision: The PSC approved the general methodology for developing Phase III WIP Planning Targets recognizing there will be specific decisions needed along the way during 2017.

The recommended methodology includes a continuation of the past practice of allowing for special cases and consideration of special circumstances.

Decision: The PSC will revisit the discussion about the methodology during the planned PSC retreat (May 2017) to make final decisions on the final details of the methodology including approving any special cases or special circumstances. An interactive briefing of the methodology planning will also be part of the retreat.

Allocation of Conowingo Infill of Nutrient and Sediment Loads- Lee Currey, STAR Modeling WG co-chair

Identify additional information PSC members would like to have to help them make Conowingo infill allocation decisions addressing who, how and when.

Molly Ward: which conversation should we have first; the who, how or when? Not in a position to commit what and when or how without input from other people in our jurisdictions. Not in a position to do that by ourselves today.

Rich Batiuk: asking what other info you would like to see

Molly Ward: this is a large range, would like to hear from the different jurisdictions to get different thoughts.

Ben Grumbles, MDE: committed to the TMDL and the Partnership. We feel strongly about taking action for Conowingo and we need to do it in a collaborative way and answer these questions. The science is saying this is a major a major point we can get an environmental benefit if we can figure out how to reduce the environmental leakage. We need to explore cost effective mechanisms so it's not punitive on one jurisdiction, but the success of the bay program and our TMDL efforts will be how we address the Conowingo. Climate change and Conowingo are really important and we can't kick the can down the road.

Molly Ward: maybe we should talk about when. If we agreed collaboratively for this to be a 2025 thing.

Lee Currey: approval of this timeframe makes sense. The feedback needs to happen at the PSC level to help frame this.

Nick DiPasquale: when is the 401 certificate due and is it a decision driver?

Ben Grumbles: looking at early 2018.

Lee Currey: the late 2017/early 2018 was a horizon when we had the 401

Ann Swanson: when looking at the Susquehanna watershed, Maryland has been a beneficiary of the Conowingo Dam. It seems that there is a responsibility of Maryland that's beyond 1% but maybe it's not measured in electrons and measured in the benefit. If there is an opportunity to share more, at a political level it might be important and we have to think about it. Maybe having a Susquehanna Watershed only A option.

Jackie Lendrum, NY: what's missing are the financial impacts of this. Looking at these different options I will have to tie them in what I'm doing next year in the WIP process and understand what these options add on top of that. Cant weigh in until hearing the financial costs.

Russ Baxter: there's a challenge for us telling the general assembly we want to protect the water quality money but now we need more because PA is in a deep hole. This is not the first time that it's come up. That's what we're facing when we go to a governor that has two houses of the assembly that aren't in political alignment as him. Need to have some of those consultations with members and its important.

Molly Ward: we have a leadership change in the federal government, and one concern we need to talk about, this partnership becomes more important than ever.

Jim Edward, EPA: could we narrow the options to option 1 and 2, because option 3 the other jurisdictions didn't get the benefits?

Lee Currey: small change between 2 and 3.

Molly Ward: no prepared to make any commitment today. We will have to take it back to our leadership. Would like to have a chance to go back and revisit. This could be discussed at the May retreat.

Ben Grumbles: Agreed.

Shawn Garvin: hearing from the jurisdictions and a lot in PA the benefits. When looking at responsivities and the benefits it all needs to be looked at. Pat has the same tough conversations but on the other side of the coin.

Scott Mandirola: will have to explain the bay program and the Chesapeake Bay to our new governor and it will be difficult. I recognize were lucky that WV has a small influence on the Bay. We will have to work any additional loads into our BMPs and MS4s if they have not yet compiled and they may be penalized.

Lee Currey: we came to a framework and want to seek approval for the framework. Need to bring more info for who it benefits, for how, you want to look at cost effectiveness, and when seems straightforward with the framework.

Molly Ward: you have support for the framework.

Decision: The PSC confirmed the members support:

- **Continuing ongoing work on the described evaluations supporting the making of a decision on who is responsible for additional load reductions, with an emphasis on**

- working towards narrowing down the ranges within each of the options and providing information on how the total reductions compared with E3 levels of reduction; and
- Evaluating how the additional loading responsibility will be assigned through consideration of both the application of the partnership's existing allocation equity rules as well as looking at allocations based on the most cost effective practices and locations for implementing those practices.

Narrowing Down the Range of Options for Accounting for Climate Change in the Phase III WIPs – Zoe Johnson, Climate Resiliency WG Coordinator

Decision: The PSC agreed on the proposed climate change assessment procedures for determining the projected mid-term (2025) and long term (2050) impacts on the Chesapeake Bay watershed loads and the Chesapeake Bay water quality.

Mark Belton, MD Dept. of Natural Resources: why are we looking at both 2025 and 2050.

Zoe Johnson: focusing on 2025 and using 2050 as a framing scenario. The effects will intensify as we approach 2050.

Ben Grumbles: what assumptions do you make in terms of forest cover and impervious surfaces? How do you deal with those landuse factors?

Zoe Johnson: the climate components are being handled in a separate track than the phase 6 model. The climate piece will be added to the phase 6 later on.

Rich Batiuk: if we get the agreement today, we will continue to bring those pieces together and look at what will be the result of those added.

Molly Ward: do we have an agreement on the assessment procedures?

Ann Swanson: not being a signatory that writes WIPs it seems this approach makes sense and the PSC should request periodical updates on early findings.

Scott Mandirola: climate change seems to involve a lot of uncertainty. Concerned about making too many tweaks to our phase 3 WIPs to address climate change when there are a lot of variables. It's a gamble. All for making our BMPs focus on dual benefits that said, I would prefer, if we start seeing more evidence that climate change is having more negative effects that we then try to address it.

Rich Batiuk: get a sense of the uncertainty and why look at 2050. the bay itself is heading in the right direction but if looking at global climate models downscale of the bay watershed. We will need to do additional scenarios to address those uncertainties. The evidence between now and 2025 we can put it away for now but want you to be informed before 2050.

Susan Conner, US Army Corp of Engineers – Baltimore: are the scenario curves consistent with our CB comprehensive plan?

Zoe Johnson: yes, more than likely. The climate projections, the range of uncertainty increases at 2050 and beyond. Focusing on historic trends between now and 2025.

Action: The CBP climate coordinator, Zoe Johnson, will schedule a follow-up conference call with the appropriate Corps. of Engineers, Climate Resiliency Workgroup, and the Modeling Workgroup representatives to work out the details to ensure there is consistency between the climate change assessment work on the Comprehensive CB Plan and the MPA.

Rich Batiuk: we can set up a call with USACE

Pat McDonnell: agree to the extent, if we can get some certainty and look at what the numbers are. Some of it feeding into the decision making of implementation is a real value.

Decision: the PSC agreed on the proposed guiding principles to be considered by the jurisdictions during the development of their Phase III WIPs.

Patrick McDonnell: We need to continue to focus on how we can stack the benefits from our investments in BMPs to address multiple environmental, human health, and infrastructure challenges from climate change. Agrees with the need to continue work by the Partnership on quantifying the co-benefits of the hundreds of Partnership approved BMPs.

Zoe Johnson: As the PSC receives more and more modeling and other climate change results, the PSC could continue to remove options from consideration to further narrow down the options so continued work could be focused on addressing those remaining options.

Ann Swanson: Chesapeake Bay Commission staff worked with the 7 options and worked up some alternative climate change language, building on the option 6 language, and drawing language from option 5 and 7. The recommended alternative language (see below) placed a focus on not only the BMPs but also programs and factors into jurisdictions 2-year milestones planning and implementation process.

ALTERNATIVE CLIMATE CHANGE LANGUAGE:

During each two-year milestone development period, jurisdictions would consider new information on the performance of BMPs and the programs that support them, including the contribution of seasonal, inter-annual climate variability and weather extremes on BMP performance. When there is a detectable impact on the effectiveness of a BMP or programmatic performance, jurisdictions would use this information to re-prioritize their actions to implement in the Phase III WIPs that will better mitigate the anticipated increased in nitrogen, phosphorus or sediment.

Molly Ward: Which options did you combine?

Ann Swanson: We combined parts of Options 5, 6 and 7. This language is offered in the spirit of adaptive management as it works to ensure we factor in our continued new understanding of the impacts of climate change into our WIP implementation efforts through our existing 2-year milestone planning and implementation process.

Shawn Garvin: Does not have an objection to combining 5, 6, and 7 as long as we understand we still have option 2 on the table.

Rich Batiuk: Explained what was meant by option 2 base conditions. Using the 2025 climate change projections, the Partnership would determine what additional loads would come from the watershed strictly based on climate induced changes (e.g. more intensive storms) and, therefore, would need to be offset in order to ensure the jurisdictions' Chesapeake Bay water quality standards could still be achieved.

Shawn Garvin: EPA wants to be sure all the jurisdictions understand what they are working towards specific pollutant reductions needed to offset climate change impacts on the watershed loads. Supportive of building in option 2 into the combined 5, 6, and 7 languages.

Gayle Barry: When discussing which BMPs are climate change sensitive, let's work through the regional climate centers to ensure we are consistent with the recommendations of these multi-agency centers of expertise.

Patrick McDonnell: Pennsylvania is comfortable with the combination of options 5, 6, and 7 as this is programmatic language. However, factoring in option 2 brings with it a host of additional questions and issues to be worked out, principle among them how would such a climate change-induced set of additional load reductions be assigned across the watershed jurisdictions.

Decision: The PSC agreed to narrow the number of options to two. First, the PSC agreed with the language proposed by the Chesapeake Bay Commission combining options 5, 6, and 7. Second, the PSC also agreed to continue to work together between now and the May 2017 PSC retreat to evaluate how Option 2 will play out, based on additional modeling results as they become available.

Local Area Planning Goals Task Force’s Preliminary Recommendations – Lisa Schaefer and Joan Salvati, Local Planning Task Force co-chairs

Joan Salvati: Pointed out to the PSC members that the reference to “some combination of the above” on the slide presenting the how “local” should be defined means that a jurisdiction can use a range of ways for defining local differently across its part of the watershed. The Task Force wants to ensure each jurisdiction has the flexibility need to tailor its definition of local to different source sectors and different geographies within its jurisdiction.

Joan Salvati: There was a lot of concern by the local elected officials on the enforceability of the local area planning goals. The Task Force has recommended this concern be addressed in the EPA’s Phase III WIP expectations document with specific language developed by EPA.

Shawn Garvin: Thanked Lisa Schaefer and Joan Salvati for their leadership of the Local Area Planning Goals Task Force over the past year. The only things that are enforceable now will be enforceable into the future.

Gayle Barry: How would the reporting occur on these local area planning goals? That is the issue that always seems to trip us up.

Joan Salvati: We will build on existing reporting mechanisms where they currently existing. There may be places where we will need to develop more formal reporting mechanisms.

Gayle Barry: As we proceed further down this road, we need to get back together and talk through how to further improve the current mechanisms for tracking and reporting on agricultural conservation practices.

Scott Mandirola: Wants to be sure for the headwater states, that we can continue to plan their Phase III WIPs and work at larger scales given their goal, in the case of West Virginia, is to reduce their loads to the establish goal levels to the Potomac River.

Shawn Garvin: EPA expectations will describe the expectation that each jurisdiction will work towards more local expressions of responsibilities because as our local partners understand what is expected of them, the more effective they will be in carrying out their roles in making the necessary reductions.

Rich Batiuk: The Task Force and the Water Quality Goal Implementation Team both recognized that West Virginia and New York are unique in that it matters a lot less in terms of where the load reductions occur within their respective watersheds as they both drain to specific downstream rivers which can be readily monitored. Unlike Maryland, Virginia, Delaware and even the District, where these jurisdictions reduce their nutrient and sediment loads matters as they need to ensure they are going to achieve water quality standards in each of the tidal segments.

Russ Baxter: West Virginia’s verification of BMPs will provide additional assurance that the reductions are happening on the ground.

James Davis Martin: West Virginia is planning to further allocate its load by wastewater, by agriculture, by stormwater. If so, then this focus on sector specific responsibilities is consistent with the Task Force’s recommendations for allocation below the state river basin scale and West Virginia’s path forward would be consistent as well.

Tanya Spano: We need to recognize the limitations of the Partnership’s models.

Shawn Garvin: We have been working on our modeling tools and we have been improving their ability to simulate at more local scales, but we will recognize there are still limits on our models as well as our underlying data feeding into those models.

Decision: The Principals’ Staff Committee agreed that the Local Area Planning Goals Task Force’s final recommendations will be incorporated into EPA’s January 2017 Phase III WIP expectations document.

Nick DiPasquale: Now that the PSC made that decision, the WQGIT does not need to approve the Task Force’s recommendations.

James Davis Martin: Still want to provide the WQGIT members with the opportunity to hear about and agree to the final changes to the Task Force's report which we all understand are minimal. This process was agreed to over a year ago when the WQGIT first established the Task Force; it was only a matter of scheduling that results in the PSC meeting coming before the WQGIT meeting addressing this topic.

EPA's Phase III WIP Expectations – Shawn Garvin, EPA

Shawn Garvin: EPA is working towards finalizing its Phase III WIP expectations in January 2017.

Patrick McDonnell: Just feels that just as we get a handle on what's happening in terms of the expectations and how Pennsylvania can get credit for practices being implemented, we are faced with working through even more issues that still require more in-depth discussions and final decisions by the Partnership.

Shawn Garvin: We all appreciate what Pennsylvania is working through.

Patrick McDonnell: In working with model, there are now a lot more "thou shall do it this way or you don't get credit in the model" edicts. Adhering to what the Partnership has set up gives greater certainty in the model and its outputs, but it also changes the narrative we have with our stakeholders who are actively engaged in the implementation of those BMPs.

Shawn Garvin: Its critical to ensure we know what has been implemented and its functioning the way it should be to reduce pollutant loads.

Patrick McDonnell: The sense of frustration is based on taking resources and applying them to prove something is there versus taking the same resources to put the actual practices on the ground.

Ben Grumbles: Thanked Shawn Garvin for all his leadership and being the "grandfather" of the Bay TMDL.

Shawn Garvin: By the end of the week, he will be sending out a final draft expectations and asking for any significant concerns with the language in the document from PSC members.

Ben Grumbles: This is a significant acceleration of the original schedule.

James Davis Martin: The original date for finalizing the Phase III WIP expectations was set by the Principals' Staff Committee as April 2017 so that the Partnership could finalize the suite of models prior to finalizing the expectations to be reflective of the capabilities of the Partnership's models.

Shawn Garvin: This is not a static document. There will be more decisions to be made by the Partnership in the coming months and EPA will reflect those Partnership decisions in the Phase III WIP expectations document.

Decision: The Principals' Staff Committee acknowledged:

- 1) EPA's plans and schedule for seeking PSC review of the draft final Phase III WIP expectations document prior to publishing the final expectations document by January 16, 2016;
- 2) The reasons behind the requested change in the schedule; and
- 3) EPA's commitment to append forthcoming Phase III WIP relevant Partnership decisions over the coming months to the final January 2017 expectations document.

Action: EPA will distribute the draft final Phase III WIP expectations document to Principals' Staff Committee members by Friday, December 16, 2016. PSC members are asked to provide comments addressing any significant concerns they have with the stated expectations by Wednesday, January 4, 2017. EPA will then publically distribute the final Phase III WIP expectations document by January 16, 2017.

Environmental Finance Symposium – MB Charge to Action Team – Jim Edward, EPA

Molly Ward: I thought that the goal today was to hear from one another on why we all voted a certain way

Molly Ward: It seems to me that Theme #3 rose to the top, do we accept this? Answer: Yes

Molly Ward: Interested to know in the next three recommendations, that got 3 votes, and why it should be a priority

Ann Swanson: CBC went toward Theme #1 because it didn't seem as vague; there are models around the country we can use as concrete examples where pay-for-success is practiced

Gayle Berry: We have done research on this topic, so this is data that could possibly be used as part of the examination of this recommendation

Jim Edward: We plan to do an analysis of all 10 recommendations, but we want PSC direction on which recommendations we want to focus on most

Molly Ward: I think we need to narrow our focus to be more efficient

Shawn Garvin: Some of these recommendations are interdependent on one another; I am struggling on how to give direct direction to the Action Team based on the fact that some recommendations are just

Jim Edward: Combine Theme #3 and Core #1

Ann Swanson: I think they are a bit different, but Core #1 is a PART of Theme #3

Charlie Stek: If there is going to be an infrastructure bill, we have a very short window of time to incorporate some of these ideas into a package that advances the ideas of infrastructure and economic development; if that is the case, this should be the focus of the Action Team

Nick DiPasquale: That bill could end up with items (roads, bridges, etc.) that have negative impacts, so we need to plan for defense as well as offense

Ann Swanson: Thinking about the workload, resources, expertise, etc., what if (for starters) we began with the combined recommendation of Theme #3/Core #1 and also Theme #1

Note: PSC members were asked to fill out the recommendations matrix for the PSC's top priorities. PSC members asked to be kept well-informed.

Note: The top priorities were identified as: Theme Recommendation #3, Core Recommendation #1, and Theme Recommendation #1. Theme Recommendation #3 and Core Recommendation #1 should be merged into one recommendation to be addressed simultaneously. Action Team members can go back to the other recommendations at a later time, if necessary.

Decision: The Action Team should complete the recommendations matrix for these 2 recommendations (Core Recommendation #1/Theme Recommendation #3 [being merged into one] and Theme Recommendation #1) and keep PSC well-informed.

Continuing Efforts to Engage State Depts. of Education Leaders – Shannon Sprague, NOAA

Want these leaders at the table more often to discuss environmental literacy Goal (an associated Outcomes). They're the people making decisions about what happens in our schools, so we need to continually engage them.

Local operating structures must be taken into consideration when figuring out how to do this work.

Russ Baxter: ESSA accountability plans now due in September 2017 (not March 2017)

Russ Baxter: Given that we have a bit more time now, what we are planning to do is to convene a stakeholder group on environmental literacy

Nick DiPasquale: Had originally discussed EC chair sending letter to his counterparts, and Dept. of Education in jurisdictions participate; want to convene this group again perhaps, and invite Fed. Dept. of Education, so that jurisdictions understand what they must do in order to get funding

Shannon Sprague: Yes, this option is still on the table

If we can get the group to convene by April 2017, a letter from Gov. McAuliffe may have more clout

Charlie Stek: an educated and engaged citizenry is critical for future restoration efforts for the Bay Watershed; I don't think we have done enough yet on this front, and Shannon has done a great job with

very limited resources; we now have opportunity to bring even more resources, so we need people at the table really pushing how important environmental literacy is to make it a top priority

Ann Swanson: So what do we need? Governors calling meetings with Secretaries of Education? CBC writing letters to Secretaries of Education?

Molly Ward: Will start with letter from Gov. McAuliffe to his fellow governors

Russ Baxter: Each State will have to develop ESSA plans, in addition to perhaps having another Envi. Lit. Summit to bring these leaders to the table at the same time

Charlie Stek: States can also apply for and use their "Formula Funds" for envi. lit. purposes, or to advance STEM education

Action: Executive Council Chair Governor McAuliffe will send a letter to other Bay Watershed Governors asking them to support *The Every Student Succeeds Act* and to pursue the available funding for environmental literacy programs. The Executive Council will discuss the Act and any Environmental Literacy items at their 2017 meeting.

PSC Role in CBP Strategy Review System (SRS) – Dave Goshorn, GIT 6 Chair

Patrick McDonnell: I want to make sure this is a recursive process, instead of information just "rolling up"

Keep the flow of information a two-way street, not just MB to PSC

Patrick McDonnell: There should be processes in place to ask for input and feedback at multiple levels, but up and down

Dave Goshorn: So add language that explicitly states the we will receive input and feedback, and direction, from the PSC down to the MB as well

Shawn Garvin: We don't want decisions to be set in stone that the PSC has had no input on, and by the time they get the information, the direction is already too far down the road to change

Nick DiPasquale: There is a division of labor between the MB and the PSC – the rollup of info from quarterly MB meetings to the PSC are the chance for the MB and the PSC to have these discussions

- The PSC's role of engagement really comes when it is decided that there need to be changes made to Outcomes
- Some members want great detail, others only want major policy issues; a division of labor write-up with explicit roles for MB and PSC would be helpful

Ann Swanson: In addition to potentially recognizing changes to Outcomes, the real issue is whether or not we are on track to implementing what we said we would and are we seeing success; and if not, how can the PSC be of assistance

- The PSC role is in understanding where we are on progress and taking actions to close gaps; using the collective knowledge and resources of the GITs, MB, and PSC to do so

Decision: GIT 6 Chair Dave Goshorn will add language to SRS regarding the role of PSC. The language will clarify that the flow of information is a two-way street and not only information being rolled up to the PSC from the Management Board (MB). The language will also explicitly state that input and feedback received from the PSC will be disseminated down to the MB, GITs, and other appropriate groups.