



STAR/Beyond 2025 - Climate Small Group Meeting

Theme: Listening Session

Thursday, February 22, 2023

10:00AM – 12:00 PM

Meeting Materials: [Link](#)

This meeting was recorded for internal use only to assure the accuracy of meeting notes.

AGENDA

10:00 AM **Welcome, Introductions & Announcements – Ken Hyer (USGS) and Kimberly Van Meter (Penn State) - STAR chair and vice chair, Breck Sullivan (USGS) STAR Coordinator, Peter Tango (USGS) CBP Monitoring Coordinator**

Announcements

Breck began with an overview of the agenda and an explanation that this climate change listening session is one of multiple that have taken place in multiple forums. Breck emphasized these recommendations are still in draft form and comments made today will be incorporated where possible into the recommendations in advance of the Beyond 2025 symposium taking place on February 28th and 29th, 2024.

Upcoming Conferences, Meetings, Workshops and Webinars

- [National Conference on Ecosystem Restoration](#) – April 14-19, 2024, Albuquerque, New Mexico.
- [Choose Clean Water Conference](#) – May 20-22, 2024, Ellicott City, Maryland.
- [Chesapeake Community Research Symposium](#) – June 10-12, 2024, Annapolis, Maryland.
- [American Planning Association \(APA\) Virginia 2024 Conference](#) – July 21 – 24, 2024, Williamsburg, Virginia. Session Proposals due February 23rd.

Climate Small Group Listening Session:

The Climate Small Group hosted this listening session to hear ideas and feedback from stakeholders, communities, and experts to inform recommendations for moving beyond 2025. During this listening session, Climate leads provided a brief summary of the Beyond 2025 effort to date and draft recommendations. They proposed a series of guiding questions to facilitate discussion and solicit feedback from participants on the recommendations via breakout groups. The Climate Small Group compiled the feedback from the breakout groups and revised the recommendations

accordingly before submitting them to the Steering Committee for the February 28 – 29th symposium.

10:15 [Climate Small Group Draft Recommendations](#) – *Breck Sullivan (USGS) and Bo Williams (EPA)*

The Climate Small Group leads provided a brief summary of the Beyond 2025 effort to date and their draft recommendations.

Summary

Breck began by introducing all the members of the climate small group who helped draft these recommendations. Breck then walked through the objectives, purpose, and scope of the Beyond 2025 Small Groups. Breck listed some of the subject matter experts whom helped inform the Climate Small Group during the drafting of the draft climate recommendations.

Breck provided caveats on the draft climate recommendations, stressing the recommendation language is being updated each day, only five broad recommendations can be submitted to the Beyond 2025 Steering Committee, the order presented is not prioritized, and the recommendations focus on the question of “what”, not “how.”

Bo showcased data that illustrates how climate change is influencing restoration efforts in the Chesapeake Bay and its watershed through rising temperatures, increasing extreme precipitation, and rising sea levels.

Bo and Breck then walked through the five draft climate recommendations proposed by the Beyond 2025 Climate Small Group:

1. Develop a Vision for the Bay of the Future ([slide 10](#))
2. Improve Resilience of Communities to Key Regional Climate Vulnerabilities ([slide 11](#))
3. Promote Carbon Stewardship as Holistic Approach to Climate Mitigation ([slides 12-13](#))
4. Promote Strategies that Enhance the Resilience of Natural Ecosystems to be Healthy and Productive Under Changing Climate Conditions ([slides 14-18](#))
5. Promote Agro-Ecological Agriculture and Community-Based Food System ([slides 19-24](#))

10:47

Clarifying Questions on Draft Recommendations - All

Summary

Ray Najjar asked about the next steps of the Beyond 2025 recommendations and the context in which this meeting takes place. Breck explained this effort began with the Executive Council charge for Reaching 2025 and Beyond 2025. In response to the charge, the Beyond 2025 Steering Committee was set up and an outside contractor (ERG) was hired to evaluate the CBP. The Beyond 2025 Steering Committee created five thematic small groups and the climate small group is one of them.

Julie Reichert-Nguyen said it may be helpful to include a definition of carbon stewardship in your slides so the audience during the February Symposium knows it goes beyond carbon markets/financing.

Jim George asked about the elements of the recommendations and if these are designed to be outcome-based recommendations. Breck and Ken said each small group has taken a slightly different approach, but generally they have been focused on what needs to be done, not so much how that will be done as that is the focus of Phase II of this process. Some of the recommendations are more explicitly focused on an outcome (i.e., soil health) and some are more cross cutting.

Kristen Saacke-Blunk said the term "agro-ecological agriculture" is clunky for those of us working within this realm. Perhaps agroecology is a recognized term that can be used, such as "Promote Agroecology-informed and community-based food systems"? Kristen said another way of writing the recommendation could be "Promote Regenerative Agriculture and...." Ruth Cassilly said this is a terrific suggestion.

Jeremy Hanson asked for a reminder of the materials the climate group is providing for the symposium. Will this take the form of slides plus a text document and/or spreadsheet? Jeremy knows the clean water small group has a "one pager", the excel template and then their slides. But Jeremy is not sure if all 3 are expected from each group for the symposium. Breck said the slides presented today, the excel document template prepared by the steering committee chairs, and a word document that lays out the five recommendations and strategies to implement will be provided before the symposium. Breck said all three types of documents are not required. Ken said the small groups had independence in determining what materials they would bring to the Beyond 2025 Steering Committee.

Jim George asked about how the climate small group is making the connection between resilient communities and the health of the Bay. Bo said the two topics are inseparable given the critical role of humans in the Bay's health. There is also a trend of moving towards more community-driven goals. Jim said from his experience, when working with communities, it is important to center their needs and not open conversations by emphasizing the health of the Bay.

Coreen Weilminster said with respect to the cross-cutting concepts, will there be a rubric or table supporting where these recommendations cross over with the other concepts (people, living resources, etc.)? Coreen is specifically interested in the human dimensions of these proposed climate change recommendations. Breck replied yes, there is a template for us to make sure we are addressing those considerations. We are still working on those materials, but the document will be posted before the Steering Committee meeting during the last week of February.

Katheryn Barnhart commented how under recommendation #4, Breck mentioned a strategy related to developing indicators for tracking health status and brought up acres tracking versus living resources (which may be a reference to wetlands). This is something Katheryn supports, but is curious if the thought is to also develop more robust monitoring programs for our living resources, such as for waterbird communities? Breck said this is a great point as tracking requires monitoring. Julie Reichert-Nguyen said the climate small group did indicate there needs to be long-term monitoring to support ecosystem change indicators but did not specifically highlight what needs to be monitored.

Greg Allen said he is glad to see recommendation 3 mention mitigation. Early on, the CBP strategy was only around adaptation and resiliency. The thinking was that the actual fixing of the problem was to happen elsewhere - federal air regulations, local transportation authorities, etc. Greg asked how long is that approach good enough? Should we look at the full footprint of the \$1.5-\$2 billion per year that the partnership manages and see where we can reduce carbon emissions?

Nicole Carlozo suggested having that slide of the 5 recommendations up at the beginning of the presentation at the symposium, so the recommendations are clear. Nicole prefers to have the goals laid out and then discussion, but just wanted to share this thought.

Peter Tango said we have seen impacts on the planet in terms of carbon footprints, and nitrogen footprints. The imbalance of sustainability of those

footprints might help emphasize the need and influence of our individual, family, community, and society opportunities to improve the balance.

Suzanne Trevena said she does not think this comment is unique to climate, but in the improve resilience and promote strategies for resilience recommendation, it still seems that most of our discussions are restoration focused (because that's the programs we work in). Suzanne's ideal approach would be that the Bay program could do more to champion protection and influence local or state planning to prioritize protection of what we have. Support the need for better tracking for those non-water quality outcomes where we do not have as complete a record. This lets us know where things are and then emphasize conservation/protection. Suzanne would appreciate a way to be more proactive and influence protection of resources. These are ideas to consider.

10: 55 Breakout Groups

Breakout groups reviewed and shared their observations on each recommendation.

Guiding questions to consider during the breakout groups:

- What are your thoughts on the recommendations?
- What additional detail and justification should we include with a recommendation?
 - Is there a case study on this recommendation being implemented well?
- Are there any remaining high-level topics that should be addressed in the recommendations?
 - If a member of another Beyond 2025 small group is present, is this gap being captured in another group?

Summary

Breakout Group 1 (Facilitator: Breck Sullivan)

- Recommendation 1:
 - Gary Shenk: Developing a vision requires understanding what people want and what is possible. Almost seems like we need to do a scientific study to see what might be possible.
 - Breck Sullivan: Yes, that would be helpful. The people centered thought process is key to understand the appetite for change.

- Jeff Lerner: There are a lot of watershed stewardship and restoration actions, so the question is how do we leverage existing energy and ensure we are not reinventing the wheel. Need to integrate climate resilience into all CBP work to ensure a holistic approach to watershed health.
 - Suzanne Trevena: Climate efforts should be more like adding or augmenting what we already have. We need to move away from the ideal of the Bay that existed when John Smith first documented his arrival in the Bay. It is difficult to get people to rally around a point, so let's focus on augmenting what we have already.
 - Nicole Carlozo: We need to tap into existing monitoring and science to understand what is accomplishable with the different strategies we are considering.
 - Jeff Lerner: We could do a separate climate assessment, but the question is what would we do with a completely separate climate approach? We want to avoid a tangential exercise that is not relevant to our efforts.
 - Breck Sullivan: Based on feedback we have heard so far, the climate small group is moving in this direction.
- Nicole Carlozo: Is the thought to integrate climate change into every single goal/outcome?
 - Breck Sullivan: We need an overall climate framework and to be integrated into every goal. We still recommend having a climate adaptation outcome, but it needs to be numeric.
- Breck Sullivan: In summary, we need to incorporate existing climate science into all restoration and conservation efforts, while being rooted in what is feasible.
- Recommendation 2:
 - Gary Shenk: I have the same question for recommendations 2-5. They all use terms like support, build, etc. We need to consider what powers the CBP has available: convene, publish and track progress, fund (partner by partner). When we are prioritizing climate adaptation, are we convening, funding, or tracking? Who is doing what?
 - Breck Sullivan: the partnership could technically be doing all of this, through different partners. We want to make sure the CBP can provide value to this effort, so this question is key.
 - Nicole Carlozo: I think about what is best done at the local level vs regional level. One of the

recommendations is directly engaging communities, so I think that is better done by local partners.

- Suzanne Trevena: How will this information be incorporated into phase II of the Beyond 2025 effort? We need to make sure this information is passed on to whoever is involved in that effort.
- Suzanne Trevena: At the end of the day, local planning and local zoning are key. We need to think about alignment between these local policies and our goal. Do we have a Bay-wide analysis of local planning? Maybe this can inform our achievement of these goals?
 - Alex Gunnerson: There was a [GIT funded project in 2017](#) which focused on local zoning. It is probably out of date, but there may still be relevant findings to support this point.
- Breck Sullivan: In our resource document, we have more details on this topic, such as connecting to local issues like funding.
- Suzanne Trevena: We may need to bring in more local partners to ensure compatibility of efforts.
- Nicole Carlozo: Was equity discussed as part of this recommendation?
 - Breck Sullivan: Yes. One question we discussed was how does the CBP define underserved or under resourced communities? What other metrics beyond race and income should we consider?
 - Alex Gunnerson: To what extent is the CDC social vulnerability index included?
- Gary Shenk: When STAC makes a recommendation to “do something about X topic” nothing much gets done, but when it is specific and actionable parties are defined, it is easier to implement. While that level of specificity cannot be included in this round of recommendations, it could be tracked somewhere for future use when we get to that point.
 - Breck Sullivan: I’ve noted that defining who could take on a task may help clarify the CBP role.
- Recommendation 3:
 - Gary Shenk: The tracking and publishing ability of the CBP could be helpful here. We could focus on positive developments led by partners.
 - Breck Sullivan: Julie had emphasized going beyond carbon markets and focusing on multiple benefits from existing practices.

- Nicole Carlozo: We need to evaluate trade-offs from existing practices. Marsh migration is a prime example.
- Recommendation 4:
 - Jeff Lerner: When working with communities, we should communicate ecosystem services that may be lost from climate change induced sea level rise. We could use data to illustrate how that influences different types of communities.
 - Nicole Carlozo: MD DNR finished up a four year study on sea level rise and changes in wetland extent, and how it affects ecosystem services (in collaboration with NOAA and GMU). Now we need to decide how to apply this type of data in decision making.
 - Breck Sullivan: We need to keep the question of how to apply this information in mind as we move forward.
 - Breck Sullivan: What current efforts might be a helpful case study for this recommendation?
 - Nicole Carlozo: Community engagement in Crisfield, Maryland.
- Recommendation 5:
 - Breck Sullivan: How should we apply practices that reduce nutrient pollution to the Bay while mitigating climate change and supporting adaptation?
 - Jeff Lerner: What are the potential delivery mechanisms for this recommendation? What do departments of agriculture, soil and water conservation districts, and the Natural Resources Conservation Service think about this? They are all potential delivery mechanisms.
 - Breck Sullivan: Yes, this was discussed in the detailed document, but I will make this more prominent in the presentation during the last week of February.
 - Jeff Lerner: There was a proposal to set up an Agriculture Advisory Committee. That might also be an approach forward for implementing this recommendation.
 - Gary Shenk: I like the idea of a soil health outcome, but this could be very tricky to define given differing methodologies in the literature. Perhaps a carbon balance metric, which would include elements of soil health, would be a better approach for now. Indicators of soil health are often defined based on specific use cases and less helpful when generalized.
 - Breck Sullivan: Good idea. Will keep a carbon balance metric in mind.
- Gaps in Recommendations:
 - Jeff Lerner: Spatially explicit planning would be very helpful. An example is temperature refugia for brook trout. Connecting

components spatially would more effectively enable implementation.

Breakout Group 2 (Facilitator: Bo Williams)

- Recommendation 1:
 - Was not discussed due to time constraints.
- Recommendation 2:
 - Was not discussed due to time constraints.
- Recommendation 3:
 - Was not discussed due to time constraints.
- Recommendation 4:
 - The Deal Island Peninsula Partnership is a useful case study for this recommendation.
- Recommendation 5:
 - Thoughts on the recommendation:
 - Agro-ecosystems are technically difficult and may yield a mixed experience. It is important to understand where others have failed/had challenges.
 - One's experience depends on how the transition to this form of agriculture is made. Consider the following:
 - Phasing the transition.
 - Economic support – utilized existing financial support.
 - Length – this takes a long time and needs a long term viewpoint.
 - Use the term regenerative agriculture. Use the term most inclusive of the multiple groups of people involved in this work. Many of these types of practices are already in place.
 - Consider how this recommendation interface with newly proposed ag advisory committee. How about the Agriculture Workgroup?
 - Potential Case Studies:
 - Mark Nardi will share reports of examples.
 - Sussex Conservation District.
 - Field trips.
 - Reach out to Harry Hughes Center for a list of farms practicing regenerative agriculture.
 - Trees for Graziers up in PA works with many farms employing agroforestry practices.

- PA Sustainable Agriculture doing soil health benchmark study with regenerative farmers in PA.
- Gaps in Recommendations:
 - Emphasize collaborative visioning at the beginning of the presentation.

Breakout Group 3 (Facilitator: Ken Hyer)

- Recommendation 1:
 - Thoughts on recommendations
 - KC Filippino: Put more detail behind the recommendation please. Pull in specifics like the Accountability Framework, etc.
 - Ken Hyer: What would it look like? Healthy watersheds has spoken about watershed plans for “watershed health” complementary to this recommendation - conceptually good synergy.
 - Jim George: Develop a Vision, Vision for the bay in a climate-changing future - weaving climate into all the goals. Oriented toward CBP role.
 - Additional detail and justification
 - In spite of climate change, aim to include the target of a healthy bay. Clarify CBP & partner roles.
 - Jim George: The vision should be a simple statement - desirable, favorable (3 points or less) and inspiring.
 - All recommendations aim to include the 3 V's. Consider that again here.
 - Doug Austin: This recommendation does not go far enough. We need to emphasize impacts already. This is not transformative enough. Need carbon reduction focus more than standard focus of nitrogen, phosphorus, sediment management. For example, the impacts of climate change are destined to overwhelm our other efforts. The next 15 years are crucial to addressing the problem. We need to recognize we are one part of the problem. The vision statement is too broad. Go beyond incorporating climate change with the vision and accelerate implementation considerations.
 - Consider carbon impacts of BMPs.
 - Include CH4 action team to help address CH4 in agriculture for example.
- Recommendation 2:
 - Emphasis on resiliency in communities here

- KC Filippino: there is no tie back to the TMDL noted. What is the relationship of tying climate change back to? E.g., improve our water quality? Is it intentionally left out of the recommendation language? Can we be more explicit about the connections of blending Clim Change considerations across goals and outcomes? Seeing a lack in language of the recommendation (and across all recommendations here) with connections to TMDL (or what else). To get away from bean counting, we need to provide the broader connections. We are already doing some of this and there is give and take on water quality goals and tradeoffs. We need to make connections in order to do all of it.
- Recommendation 3:
 - Was not discussed due to time constraints.
- Recommendation 4:
 - Was not discussed due to time constraints.
- Recommendation 5:
 - Jim George: Regarding reduced consumption of meat, it does generate nutrients runoff, but there are integrated systems geared towards sustainability. Consider modifying the language as there are different types of agriculture like mega, industrial and small family farming. We should make some distinctions in the nuances of what we are talking about here with meat production.
 - Doug Austin: I want to push back on reducing meat idea - not good. Perhaps the social costs of carbon are ignored by markets. If we incorporate the cost of carbon into meat production, it could induce lower meat consumption.
 - Peter Tango: There is an opportunity for behavior change and social science connections here when it comes to diet and nutrition considerations, regarding meat production.
- Gaps in Recommendations:
 - Was not discussed due to time constraints.

Breakout Group 4:

- Recommendation 1:
 - Thoughts
 - Seemed quite land focused - 3 of the 5 seem focused on land and people who live on the land. Too weighted toward watershed. Current goal is coastal focused, this

may have been an attempt to balance by going more to the watershed. Did we swing too far?

- First recommendation title too generic and broad. Has to be more specific and capture the intent of the individual bullets. Recognizing the importance of climate as a driver and acting accordingly. Embrace the reality and plan for it, be proactive. Key words: climate, adaptation; be intentional and explicit about the language that we use.
- See climate change as the lens through which we get every other thing done - more than just the driver. If not, we will continue to view climate as a phenomenon, not a threat multiplier. Top tier lens, not an add on.
- Do we know how we are going to define success? What is the process going to be for how we define success? Goals can be broad and hard to pin down. Some discussion but not to the level we would really need. Focused on the what, not the how - but we could put this forward as a need. Highlight this more in the presentation.

- Case Studies

- <https://www.innerdevelopmentgoals.org/>

- Recommendation 2:

- Define coastal communities and what we mean by that. This could mean a lot of different things that managers may not know what to do with this statement. Be specific about what we mean to these communities, need to go beyond just how are people doing. Emphasize the linkage between the Bay and the people. What can we do at the CBP, where can we add value? Emphasize how ecosystem services can help communities.
- What communities are we talking about? In the CRWG, communities have popped up in both coastal and watershed areas, usually in terms of impacts.
- Prioritizing most vulnerable: how are we IDing the most vulnerable - flooding, drought, coastal? There are a lot of ways people are defining vulnerable communities - how will we define it? Once decided, we need to share that definition.
- Are there resources to help these communities already? Overlap with groups already doing this work so we can support their work.
- Talk about multiple benefits - those that benefit the people and the Bay (ex. - reducing flooding).
- Is this all too much for the CBP to take on?

- Focus on the science components and how they pertain to people.
 - There is a lot of frustration with term resilient. Communities do not feel resilient and/or do not want to be seen as resilient and not in need of resources.
- Recommendation 3:
 - Thoughts
 - Greg Allen: Glad to see recommendation 3 mention mitigation. Early on, the CBP strategy was only around adaptation and resiliency. The thinking was that the actual fixing of the problem was to happen elsewhere - federal air regulations, local transportation authorities, etc. Greg asked how long is that approach good enough? Should we look at the full footprint of the \$1.5-\$2 billion per year that the partnership manages and see where we can reduce carbon emissions?
 - Case Studies
 - For carbon management, a key area is blue carbon (burial of organic carbon in tidal wetlands and SAV beds). Maybe that is a case study? There is a fair bit of work on carbon burial in tidal wetlands, including those of the Chesapeake. We are losing some buried carbon due to erosion of wetlands. At same time, wetlands are migrating upland considerably, but replacing forests, so it's complicated what the net effect is.
- Recommendation 4:
 - There's a lot of overlap between recommendations 2 and 4 (both resilience), probably because coastal communities are part of the ecosystem.
- Recommendation 5:
 - Food systems and agro-ecology - where do fisheries come in here? Is that part of community-based food systems? Would like to see fish, shellfish, and other food/recreational Bay resources represented.
 - Healthy soils relates directly to achieving toxic contaminant reductions where agriculture-practices that maintain a healthy soil biozone reduce the use of pesticides, some of which we see in Bay waters year round. This was the theme of last year's Pesticides Conference.
 - Agreement that soil health is useful beyond agriculture.
- Gaps in Recommendations:
 - In general, a few sentences for each recommendation describing the group's vision of how doing these things will put us in a better place strategically than where we are now. How

does the recommendation improve our effectiveness in achieving our CBP Vision?

- In general, the recommendations feel appropriate but not transformative. They align more with incremental change, keeping things in a normal state of healthiness. Can we lean into transformative change?
- Would like to see Bay fish, shellfish more incorporated in the recommendations.

11:40 Report out from Breakout Groups

Summary

Breakout Group 1:

- Recommendation 1: Do not reinvent the wheel. Integrate climate amongst other goals and outcomes so climate does not become some separate topic on its own.
- Recommendation 2: Consider what the CBP has the power to do. Think about partners we need to engage with and local planning considerations.
- Recommendation 3: There is agreement quantifying carbon sequestration from existing efforts is something we can take on. Consider tradeoffs of implementation practices, like marsh migration.
- Recommendation 4: Think about available ecosystem services and what might change. Consider how to apply this research.
- Recommendation 5: Engage with partners already involved in this work and consider who would advance this work. Consider using a carbon balance outcome instead of soil health given how difficult defining soil health can be.
- Cross Cutting Comment: Incorporate spatially explicit planning when possible.

Breakout Group 2: (mostly focused on recommendation 5)

- Recommendation 1: We cannot establish a vision behind closed doors. Not just a CBP vision, we need broader partnership input to ensure it is a shared vision.
- Recommendation 2: Demonstrate the important connection between people and climate resiliency.
- Recommendation 5: Change the name to regenerative agriculture. Learn from previous attempts to implement these systems, given how

challenging these transitions can be. Pursue field trips to illustrate case studies of what is possible.

Breakout Group 3:

- Recommendation 1: Weave climate needs into the goals and consider the importance of carbon dimensions. For the vision, have a simple, desirable, and favorable statement.
- Recommendation 2: Explicitly tie climate change back to water quality improvements. Highlight existing tradeoffs.
- Recommendation 5: Think carefully about the language surrounding “reduced meat consumption.” Potentially emphasize the connection to the social cost of carbon and how the market might naturally lower meat production. Be careful with the phrase “community-based agriculture.”
- Cross Cutting Comment: Provide more detail when possible. Consider including the “the three V’s” for each recommendation.

Breakout Group 4:

- Recommendation 1: The vision is too broad; need to highlight what we are trying to achieve. Need to be more explicit, such as “embrace the climate reality.” Should emphasize that climate is the lens through which we see all of our work, not just as a driving factor. Emphasize the importance of defining how to measure success.
- Recommendation 2: Define what communities we are talking about: watershed, coastal? This might be too much for the CBP to take on. Maybe align with existing implementation practices. There is a lot of frustration among communities when the term resilient is used to define them. They may still feel like they need support.
- Recommendation 3: Consider blue carbon burial in tidal wetlands in the detailed document being submitted to the steering committee.
- Recommendation 4: Consider how communities fit into ecosystems. Make sure we differentiate recommendations or combine when appropriate.
- Recommendation 5: Think of soil health in a context beyond agriculture, such as toxic contaminants. Also think about other food systems beyond those which are land-based, like fisheries and aquaculture.
- Cross Cutting Comment: These recommendations are more land based/watershed based, so we need to make sure coastal and Bay areas are supported as well (shellfish and fisheries component). Also think about the role of the CBP in this effort. Additionally, we need the

recommendations to be more transformative and less focused on incremental change.

12:00 Adjourn

Participants: Alex Gunnerson, Allie Wagner, Amanda Small, Amy Freitag, Ann Foo, Arianna Johns, Ashley Hullinger, August Goldfischer, Bailey Robertory, Bo Williams, Breck Sullivan, Brittany Hall, Chris Guy, Chris Streb, Christina Lyerly, Christina Lyerly, Clint Gill, Coreen Weilminster, David Wood, David Wood, Doug Austin, Emily Heller, Frank Rodgers, Gary Shenk, George Doumit, Greg Allen, Greg Sandi, Jamileh Soueidan, Jeff Lerner, Jeremy Hanson, Jillian Seagraves, Jim George, Joseph Galarraga, Julie Reichert-Nguyen, Katheryn Barnhart, Katie Brownson, Kayli Ottomanelli, KC Filippino, Kelly Gable, Ken Hyer, Kevin McLean, Kristen Saacke Blunk, Kristi Cannon, Laura Cattell Noll, Mark Bennett, Mark Nardi, Meg Cole, Melissa Sines, Melissa Fagan, Nicole Carlozo, Nicole Christ, Norm Goulet, Peter Tango, Ray Najjar, Ruth Cassilly, Ryland Taylor, Sarah Brzezinski, Sarah Koser, Sarah Ryan, Scott Heidel, Suzanne Cliber, Suzanne Trevena, Taylor Woods, Wendy O'Sullivan.