

Executive Council Planning Meeting – June 8, 2022

Participants:

Carin Bisland, EPA CBPO (Chair)
Rachel Felver, ACB CBP (Chair)
Garrett Stewart, CRC CBP (Staffer)
Marisa Baldine, CRC CBP (Staffer)
Amanda Davis, DE DNREC
Cassandra Davis, NY DEC
David Goshorn, MD DNR
Greg Barranco, EPA CBPO
Jennifer Star, ACB LGAC
Jennifer Walls, DE DNREC

Jess Blackburn, ACB CAC
John Maleri, DC DOEE
Jutta Schneider, VA DEQ
Marel King, CBC
Matthew Rowe, MDE
Meg Cole, CRC STAC
Shane Gutsie, PA DEP
Teresa Koon, WV DEP
Travis Voyles, VA

I. Briefing book

- A. The 2022 EC Briefing Book page can be accessed here:

https://www.chesapeakebay.net/ecbrief/2022_executive_council_meeting_briefing_book

II. Possible Meeting Dates:

- A. Potentially September 19-22 as meeting dates.

1. Maryland noted these dates wouldn't be good for them.
2. Carin concerned about consecutive meeting date options. A vacation could eliminate all dates for that member.

- B. Carin still working with EPA to nail down preferences.

III. Physical Location

- A. PSC agreed to hold the meeting in DC.

1. Dumbarton House removed from options (only open weekends).
2. Carin Bisland: Travel might be easier in DC.
3. Carin: Did we consider the Smithsonian castle?
 - a) Smithsonian may offer reciprocity for folklife help.

- B. Rachel Felver: PSC agreed to have an in-person meeting with virtual option.

- C. Potential locations have large impact on field opportunities.

IV. EC Member RSVP Status

- A. Unchanged

V. Meeting Themes

- A. Outcome Attainability

1. Topics favored by the PSC:
 - a) Focused discussion on outcomes in danger of not meeting 2025 targets
 - b) PSC members championing different outcomes and providing updates at the EC meeting.
2. PSC Response:
 - (1) We need to focus on our successes in addition to what we are not doing
 - (2) Look at new monitoring trends
 - (3) PA volunteered for champion trees
 - (a) Shane Gutsie: This is actually a mistake. Pennsylvania is not volunteering to champion trees. Pennsylvania is more interested in outcome attainment.

(b) Rachel: This was based on a comment from Cindy Dunn, so a PA DCNR perspective instead of the water program.

B. Trees

1. Topics favored by PSC
 - a) Members could take part in a tree planting or tour an infrastructure project
 - b) Tie-ins to DEIJ and climate-change: urban heat islands, redlining, etc.

C. Role of the Federal Government in the Partnership

1. Topics favored by the PSC
 - a) Focus on new funding opportunities?
 - b) How do we make this action-oriented?
2. PSC Response:
 - a) How can new tools change funding for agriculture programs?

D. Future Opportunities and Challenges

1. Topics Favored by the PSC:
 - a) Follow up on actions taken since the 2021 climate directive was signed.
 - b) Addressing flooding, river flows across the watershed.
 - c) Agricultural resilience
 - d) Upcoming CESR report
2. PSC response:
 - a) Favor looking at flooding AND drought resistance.
 - b) Agriculture resistance.
 - c) Overview of CESR report – must be digestible for policy makers

E. Discussion:

1. Carin: Need to narrow it down. Members I work with prefers actionable items to ceremony. The more we can narrow it down to EC actions on these themes, the closer we'll be to choosing.
2. Matthew Rowe: to clarify, still 3 possible themes? Outcome Attainability, trees, Future Opportunities and Challenges.
 - a) Rachel Felver: A lot of information under each category. The goal is to take the key points from each category and package them together.
3. Dave Goshorn: I'm most in favor of Outcome Attainability because it is a timely issue. Gives us an opportunity to highlight success and challenges. Segues to actions for the EC.
 - a) Dave: Wanted to note that we are advancing language changes to the watershed agreement to the EC they will need to address.
 - b) Carin: Climate and DEIJ overlays to the 2014 agreement are a big focus right now. How do we meld these together? The what (outcomes that are behind) and the how (the action taken by the EC).
 - c) Rachel: Are these seen as private discussions or public ones to advertise.
 - (1) Dave: language change should be one out of many if its publicized. Part of a broader message on DEIJ. Don't want to give the impression that we're only changing language and not taking action. Should be public instead of private.
 - (2) Carin: Combine with field component, such as a tree planting to highlight cross outcome actions. How we're working to be more resilient and inclusive.
 - (3) Rachel: Opportunity to have someone speak to all our progress and what we need to commit to over the next 2 years.
 - d) Denise Wardrop: The commitment over the next 2 years is the meat of

the issue.

4. Matthew: This conversation brings me back to venue. If we're focused on restorative justice and inclusivity, we should look to hold this in an underserved community
5. Denise: Is there a document with all of the off-track outcomes?
 - a) Rachel: yes, we can send that out
 - b) Carin: [Bay Barometer](#) is more detailed, but there's a more frequently updated dashboard on Chesapeake Progress (<https://www.chesapeakeprogress.com/outcome-status>). Each of the Outcomes has more detail if go to those pages.
 - (1) Denise: Does this site also say why each outcome is lagging?
 - (2) Carin: Yes, the site includes factors influencing progress.
 - c) Travis Voyles: It would be helpful to see the outcomes that are lagging to inform our planning.

VI. Wrap Up:

- A. Rachel: We will come to the next meeting prepared to have a more robust discussion about lagging outcomes. We will narrow down the list of potential venues to prioritize a potential restoration project for underserved communities.

VII. Next Meeting: June 22

