



## Chesapeake Bay Program

Science. Restoration. Partnership.

### Maintain Healthy Watersheds GIT Meeting

September 8th, 2025 | 11:00am - 1:00pm

[Meeting Materials](#)

[Meeting Link](#)

**Meeting ID:** 242 200 659 088 8 **Passcode:** FC9GR6m8

**Conference Line:** +1 469-208-1525 **Phone ID:** 199 019 950#

*This meeting will be recorded for internal use to ensure the meeting note accuracy.*

<p><b>11:00</b> (5 min)</p>	<p><b>Welcome and Announcements</b> – Jeff Lerner (HWGIT Chair, EPA)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For roll call purposes, please enter your name &amp; affiliation in the chat box.</li> <li>Staffer update: With Marilyn's departure from the Bay Program to start her masters, Daniel Koval (<a href="mailto:kovald@chesapeake.org">kovald@chesapeake.org</a>) will be supporting the HWGIT in the interim period until the new HWGIT staffer is hired.</li> </ul> <p>There is a new Bay Program wide security measure taking place across workgroup meetings. All attendees will join meetings with their cameras and mics turned off. If there is any intruder in the meeting, we will quickly remove them and lock or end the meeting and send a new meeting link out to the member list.</p>
<p><b>11:05</b> (15 min)</p>	<p><b>Where are “Healthy Watersheds” in the Revised Agreement?</b> – Peter Claggett (HWGIT Coordinator, USGS) <a href="#">Link to Presentation</a></p> <p>If you haven't been able to keep up with the rapidly changing developments in the Beyond 2025 process over the past year, you might be wondering: What happened to the “Healthy Watersheds Goal” in the revised agreement? In this presentation, Peter provided a recap of how the Healthy Watersheds Goal was reclassified and integrated into other related outcomes. While the process is still ongoing, the proposed <b>Healthy Landscapes Goal</b> is expected to replace HWGIT and transition into a new group focused on related outcomes:</p> <p>Outcomes underneath the proposed <b>Healthy Landscapes Goal</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land Use Decision Support</li> <li>Protected Lands (Watershed Health Target)</li> <li>Healthy Forests and Trees</li> <li>Adapting to Changing Environmental Conditions</li> </ul> <p>Outcomes connected with the proposed <b>Healthy Landscapes Goal</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stream Health</li> <li>Local Leadership</li> <li>Public Access</li> <li>Wetlands</li> </ul>

	<p><b><u>Discussion:</u></b></p> <p><b>Kristin Saunders:</b> I am trying to plant a seed because I haven't seen all public comments yet, but there have been sentiments expressed about the outcomes in the proposed revisions that are less specific. A question I think will be called for the Management Board at some point between now and next few weeks for those targets not specifically delineated yet, will be called off if we should put it off to give it more time to be figured out. I worry that in particular the reference to the watershed health target may be vulnerable. Not for any specific reason other than it's the least understood. I think the healthy watersheds goal was the least understood when it was put in the 2014 agreement, and the connection to land use and the prerogative of local decision makers to make those decisions to have a say over what happens. I feel like the deck is stacking against it. Preventive advice is the more specific we can be around the watershed health target and the reason why it is important, the better off of having a chance of including it in the revisions. I don't have a vision of how to do that, but Jeff, you and I have talked about the preventive nature of picking those places and helping to conserve them before degradation is just as important as restoration work. So there is a nugget in there about the prevention piece and getting ahead of any degradation by looking at those healthy places and making sure we do everything we can to conserve them. It's really easy for people to take stuff that they don't understand and rationalize eliminating it. I just want to mention that.</p> <p><b>Jeff Lerner:</b> Good comment. To build on that, we have greater analytical capability, better longitudinal data and changes in land use, impressed with the USGS team and their ability to show us what is going on in the watershed. We have about 60% of watershed still intact, so what are we gonna do to hold on to that. How we articulate the language in the agreement and the management strategies is what we are wrestling with right now.</p>
<p><b>11:20</b> (40 min)</p>	<p><b>Review &amp; Discuss the Feedback Received from the Public Comment Period</b> – <i>Jeff Lerner (HWGIT Chair, EPA), Debbie Herr Cornwell (HWGIT Vice Chair, MDP), and Peter Claggett (HWGIT Coordinator, USGS)</i></p> <p>Jeff Lerner presented the summary of the public feedback received for outcomes underneath the proposed Healthy Landscapes Goal during the public comment period which ran from July 1st - September 1st for the <a href="#">draft revised Watershed Agreement</a>. Feedback from this discussion will help the HWGIT leadership prepare for the <a href="#">September 11th MB meeting</a> and MB retreat on <a href="#">September 30th-October 2nd</a>.</p> <p>The following outcomes were discussed:</p> <p>Land Use Decision Support:</p>

- Key comments highlighted the importance of intensifying land conservation in response to various types of development, empowering local governments in making land use decisions, broadening use case visibility and communication of the land use data, and addressing specific impacts from data centers.

Protected Lands:

- Key comments highlighted the desire to see more ambitious and specific targets, specifically to see 2.5-3.5 million acres of additional protected lands; to elevate conservation to equal restoration; to support private land conservation and land trusts in the work of land protection; and to improve transparency, equity, and local engagement in setting targets.

Healthy Forests and Trees:

- Key comments highlighted the desire to strengthen the forest protection goals, increase tree canopy targets, create specific targets, boost incentives for conservation especially in urban counties, and broaden the scope of forest management to take into account forest age diversity, native species adaptation, and restoration of wildlife ecosystems.

Adapting to Changing Environmental Conditions:

- Key comments highlighted the desire to strengthen climate resilience goals, accelerate the timeline for the urgency of climate impacts, expand the scope beyond just nature based solutions, and support vulnerable communities and landscapes.

Next Steps: Discussion at the MB meeting on September 11th, and further decisions at the MB retreat over Sept 30th - Oct 2nd.

**Discussion:**

**Sophie Waterman:** The goal of going through this feedback is to take them into consideration as we edit our target language. Some comments we received were out of scope for the outcome language, but will be crucial for the Management Strategies. EX: supporting private orgs and land trust is not something we will call out in the target language, but will include it in the Management Strategies. We will also be talking with the Management Board about how to meet in the middle between the calls of the public to be ambitious, and the hesitations from jurisdictions on what is more reasonable. We will work on creating definitions for the public as well.

**Jeff Lerner:** Sophie makes a good point about decisions on metrics regarding what is realistic and what is desired. There's nothing that might stop us from exceeding the goals we set; if we set a goal of 2 million acres, there's nothing stopping us from going to 4 million. Part of the reason for setting it was based on the performance over the last 2 years, and thinking what is realistic with what can be accomplished in the next 10/15 years.

**Sophie Waterman:** Yes, we were just shy of our goal of 2 million acres, so that has influenced the decision. We need to be clear of what numbers we are working with, and what is realistic. We spoke with all the jurisdictions and many of them said 1.5 is preferred, but 2 million is not something they are fully opposed to. Setting an ambitious goal is something our CCP partners have emphasized. Again, we want to be realistic, and we need to emphasize that we are not trying to slow down progress.

**Kristin Saunders, in chat:** Maybe it would help to set the ambitious numbers in context: example: to meet our vision, we should be conserving x acres but given realities, we are committing to xy acres

**Jeff Lerner:** That might be something to think about, how we can paint the picture for an overall number, and showing what is more realistic. That could be consistent with what is seen with Healthy Forests, with feedback on setting more ambitious vision.

**Allison Santoro:** In the stream health workgroup, we have discussed how these outcome languages can be changed in the future, though I'm not sure what the process is like. But setting a realistic goal and then if you find you are meeting it, you might be able to bump that up as the years go by.

**Sophie Waterman:** Yes, when we talk with the Management Board, we will discuss language and the movement of some of our targets from protected lands to their corresponding outcome (ex: forestry target moving to the Healthy Forests and Trees Outcome). But if the Management Board doesn't want to move it, could we go forward with some language like "we would like to define this in the future" and come back to them once they are defined. But it is up to them with how to deal with those uncertain numbers if they want to go through that process.

**Jeff Lerner:** we haven't made a final decision on the governance/structure of this process, but in the past we have committed to an adaptive management portion of what we do. I would hope that there is an opportunity for us to still embrace the idea of adaptive management. Maybe with fewer goals/outcomes, it means we could get in front of MB on a more frequent basis, which could lead to revamping our outcomes and targets in an easier way if change is needed.

**Sophie Waterman:** if people have resources or thoughts from their jurisdiction, please send them to me! [swaterman@chesapeakebay.net](mailto:swaterman@chesapeakebay.net)

**Anne Hairston-Strang:** Are people using the dynamic forest restoration block approach, which is something we are using now. 10-15 years ago, it wasn't part of our conservation then, but we have lots more science and operational interest now. Something where you have habitat focal areas as well as water quality.

**Jeff Lerner:** Are you specifically talking regarding forest action plans? How are they identified?

**Anne Hairston-Strang:** Most of it right now is in recent grant applications. There is the inflation reduction act for stewardship; md will have landowner cost share money for practices like invasive species control/ timber improvement/ etc. things that can have water quality impacts and certainly relevant to keeping forests long term as part of a conservation strategy. Maybe some overlap with the habitat GIT.

**Jeff Lerner:** That's a good thought! Any other perspectives from other groups or jurisdictions regarding forest conservation efforts?  
I think these are the conversations that can happen with the new Healthy Landscapes goal between outcomes to avoid us from being siloed.

**Anne Hairston-Strang:** I will put some things in the chat on what Audubon has been doing in PA, and PADCNr with their signature landscapes.

- IUP's Dr. Jeff Larkin's presentation on Dynamic Forest Restoration Blocks to Allegheny Society of American Foresters  
[https://static1.squarespace.com/static/52fac5cde4b01949904a5138/t/623b665d11c14f1fae72b660/1648060005458/Larkin+presentation+2\\_2022.pdf](https://static1.squarespace.com/static/52fac5cde4b01949904a5138/t/623b665d11c14f1fae72b660/1648060005458/Larkin+presentation+2_2022.pdf)
- Pa leadership on landscape conservation
  - <https://www.pa.gov/agencies/dcnr/programs-and-services/community-outreach-and-development/conservation-landscapes>

**Jeff Lerner:** I know state forest action plans are being updated this year, im curious is that an opportunity and something for us to be looking at? Will they have a component looking at relationships between forests and water?

**Anne Hairston Strang:** I think they all have something looking at that already. This is the 5 year change, and if there are significant changes, they would undergo federal review. There may not be major changes to things like the strategy itself because much of what we are doing is already envisioned. These will focus on new opportunities on the landscape and different implementation-level opportunities. The tools developed over the last few years are tremendous.

**Jeff Lerner:** On the first outcome, land use decision support, I want to look at Use Cases.

**Peter Claggett:** I think it came through clearly in the public feedback that people want to highlight more than 2 use cases per year, and that it may not be very ambitious with just 2. Right now we don't want to overcommit, so we changed the language to at least 2 use cases. It's hard for people to review the agreement because lots of details are in management strategy instead. The intent of highlighting at least 2 use cases is that we would inventory and curate the use cases that we are aware of every year, and we will identify through the land use workgroup and healthy landscapes goal, the use cases that are relevant to many jurisdictions and will have the greatest impact. The quantity of use

cases is not the focus, it is the quality of them, and whether they can be easily replicated by other groups. If someone spent \$5 million on a project and it's a wealthy county, that would not be replicable in many other counties, and we want to see what use cases will work well while doing our best to highlight as many as we can.

**Jeff Lerner:** we will probably need help identifying where as well. The process will take time.

**Jeff Lerner:** Regarding climate resilience, I think there is an interest in implementation in different landscapes, but we don't know what those are yet. The workgroup is still in the process of identifying what those will look like.

**Sophie Waterman:** Julie put some notes regarding the presentation: Target 2 in the updated adaptation outcome covers implementation, and we are revising the language to make this clear. Target 1 focuses on identification of adaptation options, and target 2 focuses on implementation of those options. Target 3 and 4 comments will be sorted out in the management strategies; the workgroup will work on defining and identifying the sub watersheds within the jurisdictions.

**Anne Hairston-Strang:** Question: I've been tracking US forest service changes in funding/priorities, but not as much on clean water act implementation; I know that HWGIT approach was informed by tier 2 watersheds. Are there any expected changes in that kind of federal leadership that we may want to be tracking as part of this?

**Jeff Lerner:** That's a good question. We are revamping the WOTUS (Waters of the United States) so that's been out for comment. Other than that, especially when it comes to things like non point source related activities, I don't foresee major changes. I think we will be in a similar place when it comes to anti degradation policy; it will be the states who identify the different areas. Not sure how much will change on that front but WOTUS is the only thing I am aware of right now that is significant.

**Peter Claggett:** Putting TMDL aside, I don't know if any efforts under healthy landscapes are regulatory. Strategies we put forth will be mostly not regulatory. I think that is to our benefit now; non regulatory approaches to protecting the health of streams is going to be the way we do business in the near term. The non regulatory aspects of the bay program have always struggled to get the attention and resources that the TMDL does, but I'm hoping that things are more balanced moving forward with the recognition that non regulatory strategies like conserving lands and stuff is where we will gain the most traction particularly at the federal level moving forward.

**Jeff Lerner:** Yeah, there is a vision document associated with our 303D program that came out in 2022, I can drop a link into the chat:

- <https://www.epa.gov/tmdl/Vision>
- <https://www.epa.gov/nps/cwa-ss319-grant-current-guidance>

	<p>Within that document, we talk about the need for restoration and the need for protection approaches and planning. That vision is still applicable. We also issued guidance in 2024 related to our section 319 program, the non point source program, which parallels the vision of the 303d. Pointing to not just restoration but also conservation, watershed planning, community engagement.</p> <p><b>Anne Hairston-Strang:</b> regarding Shared Stewardship Agreements, that is something that the first Trump administration was intent upon. It seems like that is again a strategy where some of these partnerships we envision; pursuing something like that can help other federal counterparts understand how resources are brought to the table, and why it is not just federal money going out.</p> <p><b>Katie Brownson, in chat:</b> Chesapeake shared stewardship agreement from 2020: <a href="https://www.chesapeakebay.net/files/signed_chesapeake_bay_shared_stewardship.pdf">https://www.chesapeakebay.net/files/signed_chesapeake_bay_shared_stewardship.pdf</a></p> <p><b>Jeff Lerner:</b> We have also discussed ecosystem service benefits in the past with other groups. How do we talk about what protection has occurred in the bay, what kinds of investments have occurred, and what are the different benefits we're getting from those investments?</p> <p><b>Anne Hairston-Strang:</b> And the value of keeping a rural economy. We rely on the rural lands for healthy watersheds. We need policies that support the ability to keep rural lands rural. They can't all be public as well; we need a support system for private working lands.</p> <p><b>Kristin Saunders, in chat:</b> @Anne, thinking same....IF we planned for solar in the right places, where we want it and incentivize it, we might achieve all the things</p>
<p><b>12:20</b> (40 min)</p>	<p><b>Beyond 2025: Discussion on the Future of the HWGIT &amp; Proposed Healthy Landscapes Goal</b> – Jeff Lerner (HWGIT Chair, EPA), Debbie Herr Cornwell (HWGIT Vice Chair, MDP), Peter Claggett (HWGIT Coordinator, USGS)</p> <p>Jeff provided a brief background on the history of the Chesapeake Bay Program's organization and focuses, along with the new proposed reorganization with the four new Goals (Healthy Landscapes, Clean Water, Thriving Habitat and Wildlife, and Engaged Communities).</p> <p>He presented a model showing the connection of Healthy Landscapes goal to other workgroups and outcomes across the program, highlighting how interconnected many outcomes are.</p> <p>As the partnership approaches the final steps of the Beyond 2025 process, it's timely to discuss the future of the Healthy Watersheds Goal Implementation Team (HWGIT). Under the revised agreement, the HWGIT is currently expected to sunset and transition into the draft Healthy Landscapes Goal.</p>

During this discussion, the leadership team sought input from the HWGIT to help inform this transition, guided by the following questions:

- Re-organization and Role:
  - What should be the role of the new Healthy Landscapes Goal?
  - How can it build upon or evolve from the work of the HWGIT?
  - What role can we play in bridging together the outcomes currently drafted underneath this goal (Land Use Decision Support, Healthy Trees and Forests, Changing Environmental Conditions, and Protected Lands)?
- Membership:
  - How might the membership change with this transition? Are current members interested in leaving or staying involved?
  - What new groups or individuals should we encourage to join?
- Future Topics:
  - What projects or initiatives would you like to see this new group pursue?
  - Are there emerging challenges or opportunities members would like to explore under this new framework?

**Discussion:**

**Cassie Davis:** I'm curious how many of us are in these groups? I'm on all four of them; how many members are participating in these other workgroups in the Healthy Landscapes goal?

**Kristin Saunders, in chat:** Excellent efficiency opportunity Cassie! good observation

**Scott Heidel, in chat:** PA DEP shares that thought as well! Thanks, Cassie!

**Anne Hairston-Strang:** I'm with Cassie. Forests are relevant to lots of themes, so we have been trying to attend lots of the workgroup meetings. MDNR is active on many. It works for me to go to Healthy Landscapes meetings, and for jurisdictions to go to different workgroup meetings as well. Also could look into regional local county organizations; local counties themselves might not have individual capacity to attend, but maybe regional groups exist to send representatives.

**Laura Cattell Noll:** The LGAC is thinking about how to do a better job of embedding within the GITs. One idea is to designate a member to be a liaison to each new goal team, and that could be a path forward. It could move forward next year and each team would have a designated LGAC person to come to meetings, and then give updates to LGAC and their members for local government voices.

**Jeff Lerner:** A group within APA (American Planning Association) is the Planning and Water Network, which is an affinity group for people interested in this topic. We are talking about how to connect local planning with watershed planning.

**Laura Cattell Noll:** There is also the Mid Atlantic Planning Collaboration who do webinars on a regular basis.



**Jeff Lerner:** How do we utilize existing networks to avoid creating a bunch more meetings?

**Kristin Saunders:** coming at this from a slightly diff place, having started in the bay program many years ago from the land conservation side. Being a part of Stewardship GIT where PLWG lives still, I think that this combination of outcomes makes a lot of sense. Moving the PLWG piece over to healthy landscapes makes sense. I always felt like the PLWG didn't fit well within stewardship GIT and had to make more effort to connect with other land focused goateams. So having a home for that particular outcome aligns well with other things happening in terms of local decision making for land conservation and ecosystem function makes sense. I also think that doing that may end up supporting in a more meaningful way the original intent of what the HWGIT tried to do when the original outcome was to protect 100% of state designated healthy watersheds. There was a lot of tension that went on within the states and partnership and states wanted to be the ones to make decisions of what would be a designated healthy watershed. Having one set of metrics and one definition created tension and diverted conversation away from what we wanted to do. Many states are comfortable with the way land protection goals are set by each state and they maintain tools that tell them where important habitats are to conserve for various reasons, (farmland, forest cover, habitat) it better aligns with where the states positioned themselves around how watersheds work. I also love the conversation that's happening about better connecting this goal team and its work as it transitions to a different team, and how to connect it to not just government and local leadership folks, but also thinking about how this group works with the stream health and other habitat specific conversations. The fisheries and habitat goal team will also likely have conversations of what it looks like for them. Intentional connections will be important.

**Jeff Lerner:** that connects to what we had about membership; what should the role be? There's a lot of people sitting around the virtual table today already on other workgroups; how can we best support those activities? Should we be helping to bring those workgroups together on a regular basis like this? What about other outcomes that are not in our new goal, but still related? How do we best utilize our time?

**Peter Claggett:** Something we talked about internally is what needs do the workgroups managing the outcomes under healthy landscapes goal have? Ex: communicating x and y to decision makers. We are often trying to reach the same people; one possibility for the goal team is to identify those shared needs with the various workgroups and try to address them in a more comprehensive way, rather than each workgroup doing it independently.

**Jeff Lerner:** to add, we have had conversations about communications for reaching out and engaging with other communities, whether it's about forests, adaptation, land use decisions, land protection; we want to engage communities and land owners. We are pitching the idea that there should be a more comprehensive communications and

outreach strategy. We don't want to reach out 12 times based upon each individual outcome, but instead a more comprehensive way.

**Anne Hairtson-Strang:** deja vu all over again; the water resources registry was set up to try to handle that, but it is not that efficient. There are some other tools out there we may want to make sure everyone is aware of.

**Jeff Lerner:** maybe this is a role this goal team could play, and figure out what works with communicating effectively.

**Jeff Lerner:** this transitions into membership; how should our membership change? We can look at the composition of all the workgroups and this team, and any gaps with coverage of these topics. Does anyone have suggestions about membership changes? I think it would be helpful for us to have more representation from folks in land protection work.

**Peter Claggett:** I agree with you Jeff. Engaging more non-profits that are active in land conservation and working with local planners and governments. Getting them more involved and having them participate and be active in our work could be super helpful.

**Katie Brownson:** Building on that, I think an overarching role for this goal team might be supporting workgroups in doing more strategic conservation and restoration work at the landscape scale. I think more nonprofit engagement would be good and specifically folks involved in landscape scale / regional big watershed conservation efforts. Getting examples and being able to support folks doing the work they are already doing and learning from them on what has worked well or challenges will be important. Building more regional collaborative capacity, and tapping into groups developing that more strategic approach to conservation and restoration.

**Kristin Saunders, in chat:** Chesapeake Conservation Partnership has representatives from states and local land trusts as well as other NGOs doing work with local land owners.

- What about local planners as a cohort to include members?
- Indigenous tribes also have expressed interest in being at the table
- state wildlife action planners

**Jeff Lerner:** If you're currently a member, do you have interest in staying involved, or transition off or away based on your responsibilities and interests? Something to think about.

Or are there other people in your jurisdiction that would be good for us to connect and engage with?

- **Anne Hairston-Strang, in chat:** MD Forest Service would continue to have a representative.
- **Scott Heidel, in chat:** PA Game Commission might be good to reach out to

Last set of questions: future topics. Katie had a suggestion on larger landscape scale planning and support. Are there other ideas for this group to consider?

**Katie Brownson, in chat:** In the LULC data we could see that 60% of all new solar acres in the watershed (2014-2021) generated forest loss

**Peter Claggett:** one of the topics that came out in the feedback was data centers. Related to data centers is energy, infrastructure, water usage, solar field development, etc. Of all the land change phenomena occurring in the watershed there's two: the data center / solar / industrial complex nexus and then there's warehousing. Those are out of the ordinary from what we are used to seeing. This is also of interest to a lot of people. We have never been topic focused like that, but that could be a way to engage a lot of people moving forward.

**Anne Hairston-Strang:** Do we have much information on projections yet?

**Peter Claggett:** We do from the state of Virginia. The last I looked was 2 years ago, but it's a lot. It would be as much urban development as occurred as is likely to occur in the state of VA over the next 10 to 15 years. The same amount of land conversion would just be focused on data centers and solar. So you have basically a doubling of development in the state over the next 10 years.

**Kristin Saunders, in chat:** @Anne, the problem is hard to pinpoint the impacts because there is no one organization or entity that has their eyes on the overall proposed projects in the watershed. It's all piecemeal and different plans and permit submissions. Piedmont Environmental Council did a lot of research and crowd-sourcing to even figure out what is in the que in northern VA.

**Katie Brownson, in chat:** VA estimated that 73K-165K additional acres will be required for new solar by 2040

**Jeff Lerner:** seems to me that non-traditional partners that we should have in this conversation, such as economic development agencies.

**Sophie Waterman:** Another thing to consider with that analysis is an analysis of taxation on parcels; how much money is being made from parcels when you sell them and they become developed. For ecosystem services benefits, we need to give localities full transparency of what tax dollars a community might lose out if you do conserve it compared to developing it, but also the benefits to the land, water, health, etc. talk to communities that it might not be all about taxation money.

**Jeff Lerner:** good to bring up. How do we maintain the integrity of ecological landscapes and their social, cultural, economic aspects?

**Scott Heidel, in chat:** Potential future topic: Identifying and treating legacy sediments from historic mill dams within karst watersheds that are also designated as high quality or

	<p>exceptional value watersheds (the healthy watersheds in PA) while restoring the original wetlands to reconnect ground water with surface water to provide nitrogen removal and extremely stable water temperatures year-round, and increasing brook trout ranges.</p> <p><b>Anne Hairston-Strang, in chat:</b> Energy and utilities is a big factor in land use decisions. From the energy side, we're also looking for a modest element for woody biomass for an energy source. It wouldn't offset much solar, but it would be huge for ability to afford forest restoration practices. Getting to watershed health.</p> <p><b>Jeff Lerner:</b> moving forward, this could be the last meeting of the Healthy Watersheds GIT. The last question is if we want to meet again, and if so how? Should it be under a different title, and with the other outcome workgroups? It could also be premature because nothing is official in terms of restructuring.</p> <p><b>Anne Hairston-Strang:</b> I think a scoping meeting of what it would look like would be helpful.</p> <p><b>Peter Claggett:</b> There has been discussion of having a joint meeting of the new workgroups under the Healthy Landscapes goal in December. That is envisioned to be a thinktank meeting. For those of you on the other workgroups as well, that is an opportunity to engage in more of this discussion, with more specificity by that time.</p>
<b>1:00</b>	<p><b>Adjourn</b></p> <p><i>Next HWGIT Meeting:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The October meeting for Healthy Watersheds will be cancelled.</li> <li>• A poll will be sent out to schedule a meeting with all of the workgroups working on the outcomes under the new Healthy Landscapes team. This meeting will likely occur in December.</li> </ul> <p><i>Please be on the lookout for more information about this meeting once details are finalized.</i></p>

#### **Attendees:**

Jeff Lerner, EPA  
 Peter Claggett, USGS  
 Deborah Herr Cornwell, MDP  
 Daniel Koval, CRC  
 Sophie Waterman, USGS  
 Kristin Saunders, MD DNR  
 Anne Hairston-Strang, MD DNR  
 Katie Brownson, USFS

Laura Cattell Noll, LGAC  
 Alison Santoro, MD DNR  
 Cassandra Davis, NY DEC  
 Scott Heidel, PA DEP  
 Lorena Kowalewski, DC DOEE  
 Arianna Johns, VA DEQ  
 Gabriella Vailati, DE DNREC  
 William Harbold, MD DNR

Sarah McDonald, CBP USGS  
Angel Valdez, MDE  
Taylor Woods, USGS  
Alanna Crowley, MD DNR  
Todd Janeski, VA DCR  
Coral Howe, USGS  
Kara Kemmerer MDE  
Kelly Maloney, UGS

John Wolf, USGS  
Steve Epting, EPA  
George Doumit, DE DNREC  
Elise Frazier, VA DEQ  
Michelle Katoski, USGS  
Marisa Baldine, ACB  
Bonnie Bick