

**CBP Goal Implementation Team
Enhance Partnering, Leadership, and Management
Meeting Notes**

Date: January 5, 2015

Time: 1:00pm – 3:00pm

Location: Conference Call, Room 303 at CBPO

Call-in: 866-299-3188

Code: 410-267-5731

Adobe Connect Link: <http://epawebconferencing.acms.com/git6/>



Members In Attendance:

Greg Allen, EPA	Kristen Fleming, MD DNR	Kristin Saunders, UMCES
Greg Barranco, EPA	Mike Foreman, VA DCR, Chair	John Schneider, DE DNREC
Russ Baxter, VA SNR	Mary Gattis, ACB (LGAC Liaison)	Ben Sears, NY DEC
Carin Bisland, EPA, vice-Chair	Kirk Havens, VIMS (STAC Liaison)	Phillip Stafford, MD DNR
Jessica Blackburn, ACB (CAC Liaison)	Carl Hershner, VIMS	Doreen Vetter, EPA
Bevin Buchheister, CBC	Nicole Lehmer, CRC	Samantha Watterson, CRC
Diane Davis, DC DOE	Jackie Lendrum, NY DEC	Julie Winters, EPA
Sarah Diebel, DOD	Reggie Parrish, EPA	Kristen Wolf, PA DEP
Andy Fellows, EFC/LLWG Chair	Jennifer Pauer, WV DEP	Matthew Fleming, MD DNR

Agenda Item, Discussion Lead and Desired Outcome	Time	Materials, Notes, and Action Items
Introductions (Discussion Lead: Mike Foreman)	1:00-1:05	Summary of Action Items from January Meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action: Carin and GIT 6 staff will work together to draft a more complete governance protocol for GIT 6. • Action: We will set a date with the strategy management system volunteers for this meeting. • Action: We will bring the Governance Document review process to the MB in May.
GIT 6 Membership Criteria (Discussion Lead: Carin Bisland) <i>Discussion to formalize the membership criteria for GIT 6, which will be presented to the MB for approval and linked in the Governance Document.</i>	1:05-1:35	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Materials: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Governance Document ○ Water Quality Membership Criteria Example ○ Draft GIT 6 Governance • In the last Governance Document review, it was decided that all GITs would formalize their membership criteria and present that to the Management Board. GIT6 is responsible for defining its own membership and structure.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With regard to membership, we had previously discussed that GIT members would include workgroup chairs as well as jurisdiction members and representatives of federal agencies. • It is important to the overall GIT 6 mission in helping to assist with building capacity with partners and stakeholders to have Advisory Committee (AC) coordinators as members. AC members serve as advisory members to the Water Quality GIT, but in each case it makes sense to take a look at what the goals and missions of the GIT are. In this case, it is important for the AC coordinators to remain members of GIT 6. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In the case of LGAC and CAC, it makes sense that the coordinator serves as the representative. With STAC, it may need to be the Chair or designated member. That is something that the STAC Chair and coordinator would need to discuss. • We've identified which groups need to be represented on the GIT, but we also want to discuss the skills and expertise we want on the team as well as the number of representatives per organization (e.g., membership is very EPA heavy, but not many other federal agencies are represented). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Jessica Blackburn and John Schneider: It makes sense to have a single voice for each organization if a decision needs to be made. Membership could be extended to more than one representative, but when decisions are made one voice per organization should vote. • As our GIT work plan develops, we can identify who we think those people are and recruit people to fill the role. • With regard to defining membership for the Local Leadership workgroup, flexibility in membership is necessary. • Action: Carin and GIT 6 staff will work together to draft a more complete governance protocol for GIT 6.
Advisory Committee Review (Discussion lead: Mike Foreman) <i>Discussion of Advisory Committees' role in GIT planning and activities.</i>	1:35-1:50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Last fall, the GIT Chairs discussed that there was an impetus for reviewing and revising the role of the Advisory Committees within the Bay Program. • After discussing this issue with each of the GIT Chairs, the issue seemed to be a complaint that the GIT Chairs felt their time was not being valued or used efficiently by the Advisory Committees. This was characterized by traveling great distances only to spend a few minutes reporting out Goal team efforts but then having no further involvement in the AC meetings. • Based on several improvements in meeting AC meeting format and purpose since the original discussion, there is not a need for formal review and analysis at this time. The Advisory Committees will work to be more strategic when inviting GIT Chairs to come to meetings.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From an Advisory Committee perspective, if a GIT Chair feels they need to consult with an AC, they should be proactive in reaching out.
GIT Funding Updates (Discussion Lead: Greg Allen) <i>Updates on FY14 GIT Funding Projects, FY15 projects' status, and FY16 budget and process.</i>	1:50-2:05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Materials: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> FY14 GIT Funding Summary An update on FY14 projects will be provided to the MB next week. A few of these projects will be highlighted. Hopefully this will maintain an interest in providing this funding in coming years. FY15 projects are being managed by CBT. The RFP for those projects is closing on January 7. EPA's budget for FY16 GIT Funding will be close or equal to the same level of funding for FY15, which is \$900,000. There are still decisions to be made for how this funding will be used before it is available for GIT projects. The FY16 process is still undetermined. Previously, GIT Chairs made decisions based on prioritization across GITs. There have been talks that maybe a better process could be used.
Discussion and Approval of Revised Budget and Finance Workgroup Proposal (Discussion Lead: Greg Allen) <i>At their December conference call, the MB requested that GIT 6 refine the proposal for the Budget and Finance Workgroup to reflect the MB discussion. GIT 6 will discuss and agree to changes in the proposal to take back to the MB at their 1/14/16 meeting.</i>	2:05-2:35	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Materials: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised Work Group Proposal Changes to our proposal have been made based on the discussion at the last Management Board meeting. We will bring this back to them at their next meeting next week. Generally speaking, the MB was concerned about suggesting the workgroup would move forward on all potential work topics at once particularly since some of the work area might be influenced by outcomes from the Financing Symposium in April. There is an agreement that there is a regular need for this area of work to be strengthened within the program. The discussion centered on the timing. This updated proposal, which includes a few key areas of needed work (I.e., helping to fill gaps in GIT workplan and CBARA support) not impacted by the Symposium, will be brought forward to the Management Board at their next meeting. Concurrences on strengthening the language in category 2c on collaboration among funders.
Updates (Discussion Lead: Greg Allen and Carin Bisland) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cross-GIT Collaboration Efforts Strategy Management System/CBP Performance Assessment Governance Document Revision Process for 2016 	2:35-2:55	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Materials: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of Governance Document Revisions We had a meeting this morning to discuss cross-GIT collaboration. Cynthia Stahl from EPA R3 is willing to help us work on pathways to increase cross-GIT collaboration. We plan to initiate a pilot project based on top priority needs. We had several volunteers for the strategy management system.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Leadership Work Plan • GIT Chairs updates • Other GIT6 member updates 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action: We will set a date with the strategy management system volunteers for this meeting. • Action: We will bring the Governance Document review process to the MB in May. • We asked for additional comments the work plan in December and we will be meeting on January 20. MB review is due January 15.
Action Items, Wrap-up, Next Meeting (Discussion Lead: Mike Foreman)	2:55-3:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Next Meeting: Tuesday, February 2, 1pm-3pm