

Reaching 2025 Meeting Summary

April 21, 2023

Participants

Doug Austin (EPA)
Katheryn Barnhart (EPA)
Carin Bisland (EPA)
Katie Brownson (USFS)
Mariah Davis (CCWC)
Rachel Felver (ACB)
Chris Guy (USFWS)
Evan Isaacson (CLA)
Sarah Lane (MD DNR)
Julie Lawson (CAC)
Peter Marx (CCWC)
Kevin McLean (VA DEQ)
Gregorio Sandi (MDE)

Schedule Check

- The Reaching 2025 team is currently on schedule.
 - Outcome attainability templates have been drafted by Katheryn Barnhart, Rachel Felver and Susanna Pretzer.
 - They will be sent out to the GIT Chairs for review by the end of the day with edits and comments requested back by May 19.
- CAC schedule concerns:
 - Members are alarmed by the timing and length of formal public comment period.
 - CAC has been pushing that the public needs to have faith in this process.
 - CCWC agrees and has the same concerns.
 - The rushed timing of the public comment period, it appears that we are not transparent.
 - CCWC feels 30 days is sufficient for a public comment period.
 - Can we include the public in the drafting?
 - Can advisory committee members be included as potential writers when the outcome attainability templates go out?
 - The EC should understand that the report is a kick-off to a broader public discussion.
 - The EC meeting should provide the opportunity for more of a dialogue.
 - There is a misunderstanding of what this report is and what it isn't.
 - CAC thought this included Beyond 2025 recommendations as well.
 - Are we doing straight-forward, factual outcome attainability statements or are we making commitments to taking strides in getting to 2025?
 - Carin: What are doing with this current agreement to accelerate progress?
 - Realistically how much are we going to accelerate in the short period of time between the October 2023 EC meeting and the start of 2025?
 - Or are we looking at the progress between now and the start of a new agreement?

- How do we articulate the purpose of this report and recommendations?
- Julie: We need to name specifics on what are barriers to success.
- Peter: Is someone doing an analysis of the CBF-EPA settlement?
- Different groups may feel they have a different understanding of where we are progress-wise.
- Peter: CCWC have concerns that are beyond water quality. The Agreement is more than just water quality.
- Chris: Can we identify CAC members upfront so we can give a list of names to those interested in writing/reviewing to the GIT Chairs so they can work them into the review/approval process.
- CCWC and advisory committees assist in the review/writing of the template?
 - The drafting team will discuss further at their meeting on Monday.
 - Templates will most likely be sent out on Tuesday, April 25.
 - **ACTION:** Email will be sent to the Workgroup chairs (CC GIT Chairs) and let them know who their SMEs are. The GIT Chair should review and approve this on behalf of the GIT. Put it on them to request that their whole workgroup should be represented. Do not change whether you are on course/off course unless there is something significant that happened in the past two years.
 - **ACTION:** Rachel will reach out to Meg and Jennifer to see if STAC and LGAC are also interested in participating in the initial review.
 - **ACTION:** Advisory committees and CCWC will be provided with a list of SMEs to reach out to, to request being a part of the review/writing process.
- **ACTION:** Sean needs to reflect on concerns heard and how we plan to address them, including articulating what this report is and what it isn't the next time he briefs leadership (e.g., MB, PSC).

Outcome Status

- The outcome is uncertain by 2025 but can't say what it will take to get there. Sean would like to change as many as we can to on track/off track in the outcome attainability templates.
 - CCWC agrees with this approach.
 - USFWS agrees with this approach, but there are true uncertainties.
 - This is where climate change needs to be addressed because it is impacting every outcome.
 - Carin: Most of the time it is uncertain because it has a numerical target we need to hit, but no monitoring program to track progress.
 - Can we say, based on the knowledge we have, we feel we are doing well or not doing well with this.
 - Sean: Ask the SME for their best possible judgement on whether this is a success or not a success.
 - Katie: Encourage outcome leads to decide one way or the other, but in cases where there isn't an approved indicator or method for evaluating progress, assessment will be difficult.

Water Quality/Bay TMDL

- Can we pull information from the Lessons Learned document?
- Outcomes contribute to the WIPs (e.g., inadequate capacity is a cross-cutting challenge for getting BMPs on the ground).
- Mariah: Updates to CAST has been a challenge in tracking progress and the efficacy of projects on the ground. There is a communications challenge about the science.
 - Carin: Three issues to PSC on CAST issues should be reflected.
- Peter: Challenge related to the USDA grants. The lag time in getting grants out the door to the time work starts is huge.
- Evan: The partnership between states and federal agencies and NGOs in crafting the settlement to see what gaps exist and finding real-world solutions to address them.
 - Suggestion to look at the settlement and take recommendations from there. While the settlement mainly deals with PA, the themes address every state.
- Sarah: A success is point source controls—biggest load hitter in the model and in the real world.
 - Settlement discusses what more can be regulated.
 - Carin: Need to be careful because the settlement is more about what EPA can do, not what the partnership can do.
 - Sean: There may be legal restraints related to the settlement that we can/can't talk about.
- Katie: Can we include anything from the CESR report?
- **ACTION:** Review the themes in the settlement, the issues raised to the PSC on CAST and the SRS Lessons Learned document.