



Clean Water Goal Team (CWGT)

Monday, June 22nd – Tuesday, June 23rd, 2026

[Visit the meeting webpage for meeting materials and additional information.](#)

Purpose: This was the first hybrid meeting of the Clean Water Goal Team (CWGT) and first hybrid meeting in a long time for the Water Quality Goal Implementation Team (WQGIT). The overall theme of the meeting was: *Reset and re-center - How do we best engage each other so that we're all informed?*

- Day One: Our shared understanding of the RENPS timeline and the knowledge and decision steps to get there.
- Day Two: Our new structure and governance framework under the revised *Watershed Agreement*, discussions on how best to operate as a Goal Team, and initial Management Strategy considerations.

Day 1: Modeling and Nutrients

Monday, June 22nd | 10:00 AM – 5:00 PM

I. Pre-meeting Arrival

II. Welcome & Objectives

Lead: Lee McDonnell and Greg Sandi, CWGT Co-Chairs

Lee and Greg shared an overview of the main objectives and agenda for the two-day meeting.

Materials: [Presentation](#)

III. Ground Rules and Kick-off Activity

Lead: Jeremy Hanson, CWGT Coordinator

Jeremy shared ground rules to keep in mind for discussions throughout the meeting and led an interactive activity to kick off breakout rooms.

Materials: [Ground Rules Slides](#), [Activity Instructions](#), [We Engage Cards](#)

IV. Overview of Upcoming CWGT Decisions

Lead: Bo Williams, EPA CBPO

Bo provided an overview of upcoming CWGT decisions, deliverables, and decision roles related to Phase 7 model development, Planning Targets & Tiered Implementation, WIP Development, Living Resource Habitat Suitability Index, Criteria Assessment, and BMPs.

Materials: [Presentation](#), [Schedule of Decisions and Deliverables](#), [Planning Calendar](#)

Actions:

1. The Schedule of Decisions and Deliverables will be updated to include the correct STAC review dates and add more details to the CAP deliverables after that is more solidified.

Discussion:

- Regarding WIP development, it was noted that ample time is needed. Maybe this new phase of WIPs is less involved, but it took two years for Phase III WIPs so when dates within 2028 and 2030 are solidified, need to ensure it is enough time.
- Question on where new methods for reducing agricultural pollutants are being addressed.
 - There is room to develop that into the schedule around BMPs.
- Request for WTWG to establish a methodology for establishing new Federal Planning Targets that are fair and equitable.
- Noted error on the STAC Review dates listed. It will be updated to Feb-July 2027.
- Regarding Phase 7 model review, question on what is defined as a “major problem” and what can vs. can't be changed after the first draft of the model.
 - What can be changed is an error made by practitioners, a technical gap or inconsistency, or other thing that is wrong and needs to be fixed. Problems that have large scale implications and impede ability to set planning targets or measure progress.
 - A document is being prepared to articulate expectations for model review and definitions for what is considered an issue that needs to be fixed.
- Regarding Phase 7 model review, discussion on concerns about having enough time to review input data and products, for example the Chesapeake Bay Land Change Model, and suggestion to spend more time up front to reduce likelihood of errors being found later.
 - We will take the time needed to be confident in the model. We can't keep reviewing forever, but if there's something wrong that is found then we will take the time to fix it.
- Regarding Living Resource Assessments (LRA), question about whether the Phase 7 estuarine model will be needed to feed into this.
 - VIMS is using their water quality model for the preliminary work occurring now, and further down the road the Phase 7 estuarine model outputs could be used.
 - Clarification that the LRA will be done at the designated use scale. Further discussion on the scale of the Phase 7 model and the ability or issues with having part of the model at a finer scale than segment designated uses.
 - Note that the novel piece of this is tying in fish data to the habitat suitability index, which is tied to the availability of that data.
- Regarding BMPs, a big question is how often we want to update the model version and thus how often new BMPs can be added.

V. Planning Targets and Tiered Implementation: Setting the Stage

Lead: Lee McDonnell, CWGT Co-Chair

Lee provided an overview of what has been presented to the Goal Team over the past few months on these topics and teed up some of the key questions for discussion including how the default method and tiered implementation could work together, what information needs to come together, and what factors need to be considered for a decision.

Materials: [Presentation](#), [Phase III WIP Major Decisions](#), [Tiered Implementation](#)
[STAC Prospectus](#)

Discussion:

- Clarification that no matter what we decide for a tiered approach, deep water/deep channel will still be tracked and is the ultimate goal.
- Discussion on what the main takeaways from the CESR Report are, and relative emphasis on water quality and/or living resources. There was disagreement on how much living resources should be integrated into our work, recognizing that living resources are impacted by more than water quality, but they are also one of the ultimate reasons we're trying to improve water quality.
- Question about how criteria assessment works into this. Clarification of the timeline for the completion of the 4D interpolator tool and the development of criteria assessment protocols to serve as the rules for the tool to be deployed.
- Discussion on the Planning Target Principles from Phase III WIPs and needed adjustments. The second principle may need to be changes to account for tiered implementation since it no longer will just be about most effective basins (MEBs).
 - The MEB analysis will still need to happen, but it may look different. When thinking about MEBs before, tended to think upstream and non-tidal, but want to leverage opportunities in the tidal coastal regions and build in local control.
- Discussion on where it is most productive to start this exploration – an understanding of the final planning target and the stages/tiers or “where to be at in 2040”?
 - Some view that we will not be able to meet water quality standards by 2040, so should frame that as having practices in place.
- Discussion on the ability to measure success of interim tiers to guide later stages of tiered implementation.
 - Phased implementation of local TMDLs identify a management target that is not only relatively easy to meet, but it is easy to measure. Need to consider this in the discussion on incorporating habitat suitability as an interim goal.
 - Suggestion on utilizing attainment deficit to identify areas that are very close to attainment in the model and commit to having practices in place for those segments by a certain year.
- CBPO is also working to develop a map to indicate impact of practices in a certain place on shallow waters downstream. This ties into considering local control.
- Comments on the need for a new, holistic planning approach and not just trying to fit concepts from tiered implementation into the old approach.

VI. Lunch**VII. Planning Targets and Tiered Implementation: Breakout Discussion**

Lead: Jeremy Hanson, CWGT Coordinator; breakout group leads

Breakout groups discussed questions posed in the prior plenary session on setting planning targets. Following breakout discussions, each group shared out initial perspectives for how to approach planning targets, what big questions remain, and what problems or sticking points need to be figured out.

Materials: [Presentation](#), [Phase III WIP Major Decisions](#), [Tiered Implementation STAC Prospectus](#)

Actions:

1. CWGT Members are asked to share an answer to “What does Tiered Implementation mean or look like to you? (Signatories should have one answer per signatory)” to aid in

our future discussions on planning targets. Please send your response to CWGT leadership by Wednesday, July 8th. We will synthesize responses and discuss at an upcoming CWGT meeting.

2. Following further CWGT discussion, CWGT members should discuss with their PSC member to further clarify their understanding of what the 2040 commitment in the revised Watershed Agreement means.

Discussion:

- Question on the meaning of “interim” vs “ultimate” in the discussion questions about 2040, recognizing that the *Watershed Agreement* outlines 2040 with a check-in in 2033.
 - Ultimate would mean all practices in place to meet water quality standard for all criteria in all segments. Interim would mean some in-between before that with another step afterwards.
 - Based on rates of attainment so far, even with acceleration of implementation, it seems unlikely for 2040 to be that “ultimate” benchmark.
- In-Person Group 1: Team Badger Foxes
 - Key Points
 - Allocations for tiers could be based on shallow/deep, designated criteria targeting, splitting time for certain level of practices in place, or incorporate de-listing work somehow.
 - Barriers/challenges include maintenance, 2025-2040 being a heavier lift than 2009-2025 since “low hanging fruit” are gone, and difficulty of planning for people’s willingness and ability to maintain or fund BMPs in the future.
 - Needs include smart messaging/education and small-scale monitoring to measure local BMP impacts and results from early pay for performance efforts.
 - Opportunities include showcasing more success stories and continuing to improve relationships and get buy-in from ag with trusted messengers.
 - Concern about the danger of changing the expectations around the 2040 benchmark.
 - Questions
 - What exactly is tiered implementation? How does that affect planning targets?
 - Can different states have different approaches to tiered implementation?
 - Can we keep our trajectory (from 2009-2025) through 2040? What is realistic “acceleration”?
 - Is Conowingo included in new Targets/WIPs or separate?
- In-Person Group 2: Team Fun
 - Key Points
 - Biggest concern is around communication and messaging, especially if expectations around 2040 change. Importance of keeping support from varied stakeholders, communicating successes as milestones not “we’re done”, and what new or different practices are being done.
 - Suggestion to approach writing a plan with two buckets – the first tier outlining x BMP implementation at x level with a highlight on specific jurisdiction priorities in the short-term, which could align with a living resource or specific segment, and then a second tier recognizing that x further implementation would be needed to reach full deep water/deep channel.

- Differing thoughts on how ambitious vs. realistic a plan should be, but general agreement to be more ambitious.
 - Challenges include BMP verification, mass balance, finding willing landowners, and updated models changing the goalposts/making communication of progress difficult.
 - Opportunities around the human side of local living resources engaging the public more.
 - Needs include classification of different WIP phases/the progression of how WIPs have evolved and sector-specific communications to have a common message within a sector across the watershed.
 - Questions
 - What are the possibilities of tiered implementation?
 - What's the best way to present this and how do we pursue it to get the most people on board?
- In-Person Group 3: Team River Otters
 - Key Points
 - Opportunities include new technologies, BMPs, and market-based solutions (potentially developing a joint state/federal funding program for this); focusing on tributaries which have shown far more improvement than main stems; and targeting funding and resources at the local level for maximum impact and local autonomy.
 - Challenges/barriers include limited monitoring, especially at local level.
 - Needs include improvement of the TMDL Indicator and development of a user guide for all the tools that exist to bring wider use of them.
 - Need to define our end goal first and determine ideal sequencing. Also identify areas that are close to attainment, have local control, and depend on the partnership.
 - Questions
 - What does tiered implementation mean, especially since not all jurisdictions have the ability to target locally?
 - If we're talking about accelerating attainment of individual segments, what does that mean for the feedback loop within the Bay itself? Does it improve the resiliency or assimilative capacity of the Bay?
- Virtual Group 1: Team Oysters
 - Key Points
 - Opportunities include focusing on shallow waters and small streams for building local buy-in, targeting areas closest to attainment, and utilizing tiered implementation as a way to create measurable wins to build momentum.
 - Challenges include fatigue in local governments, communication to and strengthening support from the public, and changing environmental conditions.
 - Need to consider how tiered implementation would work in non-tidal waters, but also not forget about less visible areas. Value of tiered approach comes with connecting people with the waterways they live around.
 - Needs include better understanding the connection between living resources and the water quality criteria to ensure it is not a modeling "black box".
 - Discussion on keeping tiering grounded in regulatory standards and water quality standards vs. a habitat suitability approach. How can we

- meet in the middle? Worry that we are focusing too much on iconic species and note that their populations are impacted by changing environmental conditions and other factors - not just water quality.
 - No consensus on whether 2040 is seen as an interim or ultimate target.
 - Questions
 - What are the responsibilities and roles of the CWGT vs. the Healthy Landscapes Goal Team and the Thriving Habitat, Fisheries & Wildlife Goal Team? What does cross Goal Team interaction look like on living resources as it related to tiered implementation?
 - Virtual Group 2: Team Blue Crabs
 - Key Points
 - Big focus on communication - how to keep partners engaged and get more buy-in. Acknowledging fatigue of constantly asking more and more from people, we need to clearly communicate what we are asking, especially at the local level.
 - General agreement that 2040 is not “the end” and we need to talk about sustainability beyond then. Need to be honest about what is achievable and sometimes have hard conversations with people on that.
 - Needs include increasing, or at least maintaining, funding to get resources to where we need them; better understanding of monitoring data and how it is being used to address different challenges or future changes; and better understanding of growth and future changes.
 - Opportunities include a multi-sector approach to not divide out our initiatives and foster greater collaboration in general. Suggestion to engage Land Use Workgroup, Local Government Advisory Committee and other groups to do this.
 - Challenges include implementation of BMPs getting harder due to less room for large-scale projects in viable places and the difficulty for jurisdictions that are not entirely in the Chesapeake Bay watershed to focus support and resources for the Bay.
 - Questions
 - How does this relate to monitoring and the creation of tools and integration with the CAST model?
 - How do we best prioritize, given limit time, resources and energy? Geographically or by sector? Another way?
 - Full Group Discussion
 - Discussion on what “tiered implementation” means, since that was a key question from many groups. Various members shared their interpretation including notions about prioritizing work between now and 2040, finding places to accelerate progress, acknowledgement of the difficulty of reaching deep water/deep channel dissolved oxygen, and opportunities to document short term successes.
 - Discussion on what is more important to determine first – a shared understanding of “tiered implementation” or setting the ultimate target? How can we determine what can be done by 2040 if we haven’t set numbers yet? At the same time, we need to start talking about possibilities now. No clear consensus.
 - Suggestion to solicit definitions from people offline and hold a robust discussion at a following CWGT meeting, acknowledging these are “working answers” and we will need to be flexible.
 - With the new WQ,SAM outcome and development of criteria for all designated uses, looking at all criteria may impact setting of targets. Attainment of criteria

with a lower level of effort than the deep water/deep channel could be used as interim goals.

- General support for the need for careful, clear communication around this and the opportunity of tiered implementation to build a broader constituency to accelerate progress.

VIII. Break

IX. Base Year: Breakout Discussion

Lead: Auston Smith, EPA CBPO; breakout group leads

Auston presented a brief refresher on the status of E3 Scenario development and a primer with considerations for base year choices. Breakout groups discussed what criteria (level of confidence in data, consistency with Phase 6 or growth considerations) matters most to them and which year (2010, 2022 or other) they are leaning towards. Following breakout discussions, each group shared out a summary of their discussion and what sticking points or questions remain in advance of a decision in September.

Materials: [Presentation](#), [Base Year Considerations Handout](#)

Actions:

1. The CWGT will have presentations from source sector workgroups in August, working towards finalizing the scenario base year and E3 scenario input assumptions in September. CBPO will work to expand on the table of criteria for 2010 vs. 2022 as scenario base year choices with additional details and explore how the growth issue can be approached.

Discussion:

- Clarification on the growth consideration and why it is not accounted for through changes in the hockey stick at a basin scale.
 - If a more recent year, like 2022, is chosen then it “grandfathers in” any growth between 2010 and then. The only change to the hockey stick graph is the y-axis intercept of the non-point source allocation line.
- In-Person Group 1: Team Badger Foxes
 - Key Points
 - No consensus on 2010 vs. 2022. About 2/3 in favor of keeping 2010. Too many questions remain to say what would move people one way or the other right now.
 - The second principle of planning targets would suggest keeping 2010.
 - Request to expand the table of criteria with more detail based off questions raised today.
 - Questions
 - Do we need this decision by September 2026? Why? Do we need base year for the land use model?
- In-Person Group 2: Team Fun
 - Key Points
 - Generally aligned on an overall preference for 2022, with the main priority of using the most current and accurate data to inform the work we're doing. This is important for public perception, too.
 - The growth consideration was a major concern since it seems to penalize jurisdictions that have had less or smarter growth.

- Less concerned with consistency across model phases, since many other things are changing with the new model as well.
 - Questions
 - If 2022 is used, how can the growth between 2010 and 2022 be smoothed out or normalized to avoid the growth issue?
 - Given the various data sources, is it possible to choose different base year options for different sectors? Or choose only certain datasets to update? No, it has to be the same across the board.
- In-Person Group 3: Team River Otters
 - Key Points
 - More support for 2010, but many undecided. Those leaning towards 2010 prioritized consistency.
 - The growth consideration was a major concern. If 2022 were chosen, there would have to be some sort of special allocation for those states who had no or negative growth over that time period.
 - Communication will be key regardless of which year is chosen.
 - Questions
 - What degree of “greater confidence” in the updated data are we talking about? How much of a difference is there?
- Virtual Group 1: Team Oysters
 - Key Points
 - Support for prioritizing confidence in updated data, but if the growth issue cannot be accounted for in some form then the base year should be 2010.
 - On the growth issue, request for an explanation on why it has to be this way. Just because we did it in Phase 6 doesn’t mean we can’t change the method.
 - Questions
 - Can the growth be accommodated for to not just “grandfather” it in and distribute it across basins? If not, why can this not be modified?
- Virtual Group 2: Team Blue Crabs
 - Key Points
 - Many were undecided, but those that expressed a preference were leaning towards 2022 primarily to prioritize using most up-to-date data and strengthen public confidence.
 - Less concerned with consistency across model phases, since they will be hard to compare anyways because of other changes.
 - Conversations around the responsibility of growth need to occur.
 - Questions
 - What are the pros/cons of choosing one year over the other? i.e. what are we losing, like trend information, if we go with 2022?
- Full Group Discussion
 - Further discussion on the growth issue and requests to explore a new method to better allocate growth to ensure responsibility for growth is accounted for.
 - Suggestion that if 2022 is chosen with the rationale of using the most up-to-date data, then the decision documented should be the choice to *always* use the most up to date data. That way, in the next model phase, we can stick with that decision and update to the newest data.
 - Clarification on what the baseline is. Is it the condition in which we are comparing ourselves to moving forward?

- Water quality standards would still use 2010, but for other things moving to 2022 it would allow us to use more recent data.
 - Regarding the consistency concern, even if 2010 is chosen, the loads in the CAST scenario for 2010 will change because it will be backcasted from the Phase 7 land use. So, it will be different no matter what.
 - Concern that this means the goalposts are moving.
 - The water quality standards and the TMDL aren't changing. How hard it is to get there based on growth and other things will likely change.

X. Hydrologic & Critical Period

Lead: Robin Glas, USGS; Lew Linker EPA CBPO

Robin provided an update on the analysis for the hydrologic period and primer on considerations for choices. The group decided to stay in plenary instead of breakout groups given the need for Robin's expertise to answer questions. The group discussed initial perspectives for choice of hydrologic period for Phase 7, what questions remain, and what problems or sticking points need to be figured out. The top three candidate windows from the current analysis, a summary of the analysis and remaining considerations, and key discussion questions are outlined on slides 13-15 of the presentation.

Materials: [Presentation](#), [Hydrologic Period Considerations Handout](#)

Actions:

1. Robin Glas will prepare a full sensitivity analysis across all parameters and address remaining requests for the Hydrologic and Critical Period analysis including weighting of flows, full water year information, and comparison of dissolved oxygen attainment information ahead of the CWGT September decision. Lew Linker, Richard Tian, Tish Robertson, and others will follow up via email on the dissolved oxygen attainment comparison piece.
2. Updated slides on the Hydrologic and Critical Period analysis will be posted. *Completed.*

Discussion:

- Question about whether the available monitoring data for candidate critical periods is factored in as a selection consideration.
 - The scenario-corrected approach could be used on different periods with different amounts of data. That's likely an independent consideration.
 - More recent periods likely have more data, including continuous water quality data. This could help the monthly flow composite in the analysis.
- If the period that is chosen is at a time when Conowingo is already in dynamic equilibrium then are the Conowingo impacts already included, or does a separate evaluation need to occur?
 - We likely need to know both Conowingo pre-dynamic equilibrium and post-dynamic equilibrium. Then we will be able to judge what the Conowingo load is.
- Question on whether the periods need to remain 10 years for hydrologic and 3 years for critical period, or could they be opened to different lengths?
 - It would not be possible to make it a longer timeframe for model runtime. The 10-year return period as the critical period threshold is based on the TMDL.
- One of the proposed critical periods includes 1996 which was "the big melt" and last time it was decided to avoid that year in the critical period. Suggestion to exclude some years as not viable candidate periods in the analysis due to extreme events. It may be possible

to excise a specific storm while keeping the overall period if the rest of it is a good candidate window.

- Flows from October to June were used in this stage of the analysis for ease of coding. Request to expand that to the full water year.
- Note that 1997 was the year that was identified as the basis for identifying segments that would qualify for the deep water/deep channel use, if that is helpful to consider.
- Discussion on whether prioritizing “modern/recent” conditions or the long-term conditions should be prioritized.
 - Discussion on whether the post-2010 period being anomalously wet indicates a new normal or a transient change. Everything we’ve seen points to a long-term trend of higher flows and higher precipitation continuing. The question is whether the short-term trend of post-2010 is part of an oscillation or not.
 - It’s easy to find a good critical period that is more recent, but it’s difficult to find a good more recent hydrologic period if we are sticking to the definition that the hydrologic period has to be representative of long-term conditions.
 - The motivation for redoing this analysis and potentially changing the hydrologic period was to have a more modern analysis with more recent data, not necessarily that the period itself should be more recent years.
 - An appeal to a more recent period, like 2004-2006, is the overlap with more high frequency data, at least in Virginia.
 - If a drier period is chosen and upcoming years are wetter, would the model show more non-point source loads than what we’re planning for?
 - No, the model uses a delta method to see how far we have changed from the base period, so it is normalized and that should not impact it.
 - Question on whether a move to a wetter period “bakes in” the precipitation part of changing environmental conditions, instead of having base planning targets and then adjustments for changing environmental conditions separate as done previously.
 - The only thing that is “baked in” is the comparability, or lake thereof from Phase 6 to Phase 7.
 - Stream flow is an aggregate of precipitation, so that signal is in there somewhere. The non-stationarity of stream flow is currently baked into the critical period, but it is not baked into the hydrologic period.
- Discussion on variability and sensitivity analysis.
 - The current analysis weights parameters with binary options of 1 or zero. For this analysis, mean is weighted 1 and all others as zero.
 - The mean flow and high flow should likely be weighted higher than low flow.
 - Request for a full sensitivity analysis with different weighting of parameters. Robin will run these and present them in a matrix to help CWGT rank the outputs of the different weighting combinations.
- Request for running the Phase 6 hydrologic and critical periods (1990-2000 and 1993-1995) with the current analysis to see how they compare to the top candidate periods presented.
- Request for the dissolved oxygen attainment picture in the 1993-1995 period compared to the candidate periods as well. It could help us understand how things might change if we went with a different critical period.
- Clarification on the timing for this decision.
 - CWGT needs a decision by September 2026 because the modeling team will need to work on having the suite of models ready for the year of review afterwards.

XI. Wrap Up

Lead: Lee McDonnell, Greg Sandi

Lee provided a recap of the day's discussions, noting action items and key points where continued discussion is needed. He also gave an overview of the agenda for Day 2.

Day 2: Goal Team Operations and Management Strategies

Tuesday, June 23rd | 9:00 AM – 3:00 PM

I. Pre-meeting Arrival

II. Welcome, Day One Refresher & Objectives

Lead: Lee McDonnell and Greg Sandi, CWGT Co-Chairs

Lee shared a brief recap of the first day and gave an overview of the main objectives and agenda for the day.

Materials: [Presentation](#)

III. Review of Member Feedback Conversations

Lead: Jeremy Hanson, CWGT Coordinator

Jeremy shared key themes, points of alignment and points of contrast heard from feedback conversations with WQGIT members in the last couple months.

Materials: [Member Feedback Summary Slides](#)

Actions:

1. If you enjoyed the member feedback interviews, reach out to Jeremy, Petra and Caroline to let us know what we could do to improve and how often you'd like to continue to check in.
2. Please share further ideas with CWGT leadership on best ways to streamline communications, what background materials and in what form would be most useful, and any related feedback for us to implement now or work towards in the future.

Discussion:

- Comment in the chat noting a collective need to do a better job of building a broad public constituency for Bay protection, conservation, and restoration.
 - It was noted that these member feedback conversations were specifically focused on internal efforts, but this is a good note for external efforts.
- Note that one of the priority topics for the years ahead should be developing assessment rules.
 - Acknowledgement that interviews were not conducted with STAR and Monitoring members/participants. However, monitoring did come up as a topic of interest for existing goal team members.
- Question/request for group insight regarding the level of detail of topics that should be discussed at the CWGT versus the technical workgroup level.
 - Response that a similar comment has been received in the past. Proposed solution: The Modeling Workgroup, or other technical workgroups, could, for example, work on refining hydrologic year period options for the CWGT to review and select from.
 - Comment expressing concern over making decisions at the technical workgroup level and uncertainty as to what items need to be elevated to Goal Team members or not.
 - Confirmation that we will continue to discuss these types of questions throughout the day. Acknowledgment that educational overviews, although in the weeds, have been provided at the last few Goal Team

meetings to get members on the same page. Though it was noted there have been varying opinions on the value or need for these overviews.

- Question on what “MTM” stands for.
 - Answer: Multiple Tributary Models
 - Acknowledgement in the chat that that would be invaluable with regards to WIP development.
- Suggestion to improve documentation of tools and processes that are being developed, especially CAP tools/decision rules. It was noted that, beyond meeting minutes and materials, tools and modeling components should be captured in a white paper, “book down”, or other similar documentation mechanisms for future reference, transparency, and reproducibility.
 - Acknowledgement that turnover is common. Request for clarification on the desired audience for these documentation materials.
 - Response that documentation should be developed in layman’s terms or easily consumable by the public. Documentation should be approachable.
- Request for additional group discussion on things that are going well or could be improved.
 - Comment that BMP implementation should be coming up through workgroups. Things like cost effectiveness and BMP lifespan should still be WTWG items and eventually come to the CWGT, so that doesn’t necessarily need to be top of mind for the Goal Team.
- Suggestion to consider easily searchable and findable documentation to make things more accessible. Examples shared included “blue bibles”, MD DNR assessment documentation, etc.
 - Response that the one pagers and meeting materials provided for today were in the hopes of providing evergreen and easily referenceable materials. It was also noted that some orientation packets exist for the Goal Team and Workgroups, but these will need to be updated.
 - Indication that additional information is needed, especially for the new workgroups, on the “who” and the “where” of the newly formed teams and how the groups will integrate with the Clean Water Goal Team structure.
 - Acknowledgement that sometimes words and terms are used with different meanings, so that is another aspect that could be clarified in documentation efforts moving forward.
 - Suggestion from a former staffer that there might be a useful onboarding document and list of acronyms accessible to staffers that can be repurposed as documentation is developed.

IV. Goal Team Operations & Structure: Setting the Stage

Lead: Lee McDonnell, CWGT Co-Chair

Lee shared the latest updates to CWGT structure and CBP governance and highlighted the key remaining points of discussion raised over the last couple months, including an update on discussions about where the function of the Federal Facilities Workgroup should reside, which the CWGT reached consensus to be integrated into the Watershed Technical Workgroup.

Materials: [Presentation](#), [Workgroup Descriptions](#), [CWGT Revised Structure](#) (6.15.26), [CWGT Approved Structure](#) (6.24.26)

Decisions:

1. CWGT members approved the proposal to integrate the functions of the Federal Facilities Workgroup into the Watershed Technical Workgroup.

Discussion:

- Call for a consensus vote to integrate the functions of the Federal Facilities Workgroup (FFWG) into the Watershed Technical Workgroup (WTWG):
 - Comment made by a Clean Water Goal Team member that they are in support of integrating the functions of the FFWG into the WTWG, but that they would appreciate guidance as to how we will deal with setting the federal load reduction targets in 2028, given this new structure and that the process is separate from reporting/accountability.
 - Response from Goal Team leadership that setting the federal facilities goal could be a logical reason for standing up an Action Team when the time comes.
 - Comment in the chat noting that the federal coordination references in the GMF has been significantly changed. References to the Federal Management Committee (FMC) have been removed from the GMF. Coordination at the PSC level have only a brief reference now.

V. Goal Team Operations & Structure: Discussion

Lead: Lee McDonnell, CWGT Co-Chair

Lee led a discussion with the CWGT on how best our Goal Team can work together. Key discussion topics included outlining the role of the Goal Team, defining membership especially for workgroups, and understanding new decision-making approaches. Full discussion questions are in the posted slides below.

Materials: [Discussion Questions](#), [Governance and Management Framework \(GMF\) Draft \(06.09.26\)](#), [Final GMF \(6.30.26\)](#), [Current WQGIT Governance Protocols](#), [Current Workgroup Membership Lists](#)

Actions:

1. CBPO will explore creating better documentation of existing and in-development tools, including indicators, to help transparency and reproducibility.
2. CWGT will provide more direction to workgroups on drafting of workplans to ensure they are developed with the context of Goal Team priorities and Management Strategies.
3. Calls for nominations for CWGT at-large member positions and solicitation for Monitoring Workgroup and DAR leadership will be sent following this meeting with nominations due mid-July.
 - a. *Post-meeting note: Calls for nominations were shared June 25th and received with a deadline of July 15th.*
4. All workgroups are requested to share their recommendation for their workgroup's membership to conform to the 9 signatory/6 at-large member structure or share their desire and justification for an exception. If possible, please send your recommendation to CWGT leadership by July 31st. If not possible, please discuss at your next workgroup meeting and update CWGT leadership on an expected timeline for your workgroup to transition membership.
 - a. *Post-meeting revision sent to CWGT members and Workgroup Chairs July 10th: All workgroups are requested to share their recommendation for their workgroup's membership to conform to the 15 voting member structure. If possible, please send your recommendation to CWGT leadership by July 31st. If not possible, please discuss at your next workgroup meeting and*

update CWGT leadership by July 31st on an expected timeline for your workgroup to transition membership.

5. When membership changeovers occur, an email will be sent to all Interested Parties on that workgroup's listserv to let them know the membership changes that have occurred.
6. CWGT leadership will provide additional clarity on the decision-making process (consensus vs. consent vs. super majority voting) outlined in the new Governance and Management Framework (GMF). The presentation slides will also be updated to maintain consistency with the GMF.
7. A CWGT-specific document will be developed to clearly outline key items from the GMF and additional details on instances of membership, and other, variations within CWGT workgroups.
8. To improve cross-goal team communication, if you have any suggestions for topics to be discussed at the bi-weekly Goal Team chairs meetings, please share them with Lee and Greg. Land use was discussed on Day 2 and the Chesapeake Bay Land Change Model will be presented to CWGT for approval.
9. An updated workgroup membership spreadsheet will be posted to include additional groups that are integrating into the Monitoring Workgroup (Hypoxia Collaborative and Data Integrity Workgroup) for reference. *Completed.*

Discussion:

- Question on the decision-making process for the Goal Team and whether or not the Clean Water Goal Team will still operate on consensus.
 - Response from CWGT leadership that the new Governance and Management Framework outlines the ability for the Goal Team to have supermajority voting.
 - Confirmation that, if needed, supermajority voting may be employed.
- Inquiry from a Workgroup chair as to whether or not the Goal Team will be giving the Workgroups direction on the development of Workgroup Workplans or if they would just like to endorse the Workgroup Workplans at the end of the process.
 - Response that additional information will come in the July and August meetings about Management Strategies and CWGT will receive report outs from management strategy outcome leads. Since workplans won't be going out for public feedback, there is a longer runway for the development of the Workgroup Workplans.
 - Comment that it would be useful to have the process clearly laid out, along with additional direction to the Workgroups, so that the Workplan development can be as useful as possible and that the Workgroups produce a product consistent with the Goal Team's request.
 - Suggestion that Workgroup Workplans be delayed until around September when Management Strategies are more fully developed.
- Question related to the hierarchy/accountability of the Goal Team and related workgroups- who reports to who?
 - PPoW will not report to TCW. Unless something is called out specifically in the charge, such as the AMT, the other Action Teams would report to the Goal Team. Clarification provided that the structure slide is not necessarily a hierarchical visualization of the groups.
 - Confirmation in the chat from workgroup chair on this "nested approach".
- Comment that there is some confusion around terminology, specifically for the Management Strategies, Workplans, Watershed Agreement etc.

- Response that there are also some outcomes with targets that multiple workgroups will work on, so it is not a simple one-to-one.
- Regarding the level of detail that is brought to the Goal Team, it was noted that some level of detail and comfortability with all components now under the Goal Team, including CAP efforts, etc., will be necessary. An example was given that it would be useful to have an overview of how many different components (4D interpolator, assessments, and model output) work together. That way, people can communicate about these items and why they matter if needed.
 - Agreement shared by the group. It will be an objective of CWGT staff/leadership to help aid in this understanding of the technical components.
 - Question posed to the group on how we should go about distributing/receiving this information.
 - Request from a member to avoid presenting new information or providing information that would be critical to decision making at office hours. Office hours should be kept informal for questions and answers.
 - Suggestion for an informational session at a Goal Team meeting, followed by an office hours, followed by another Goal Team meeting to discuss key topic areas. Avoid covering detailed technical topics in one meeting.
 - Note in the chat suggesting informational overview presentations be posted online.
 - Comment from Workgroup Chair that work at CAP is at the nexus of science and policy. So, communication is important, especially in that arena. Commitment was shared to helping people understand the technical underpinnings of criteria implementation, and support was noted for the previous idea of having multiple informational sessions.
 - An opinion was shared that getting into the weeds is critical to understanding management implications of some decisions. So, finding the sweet spot and allowing people to opt in/out of a second informational meeting on a given topic might be best.
 - A concern was also noted that some office hours and workgroup meetings are overlapping. The meeting calendar should be reviewed before determining meeting timeframe. In past years, workgroups met much more frequently, so the group could consider reverting back to that format.
 - A member shared frustrations that there were 19 meetings on the Bay Calendar for the month of July and 34 across June through July. Given time and staffing constraints, additional meetings are not likely feasible.
 - Endorsement in the chat for informational sessions abutting formal meetings and the need for detailed discussion.
 - Reminder to the group that handouts and other briefing materials are available on the technical topics for the June meeting. It was requested that members inform CWGT leadership/staff when or if these briefing materials would be helpful for a specific topic, and similar materials can be compiled.
- Comments shared that meeting minutes are helpful for each workgroup, but a central repository for workgroup summaries would be useful.
 - Note that AI features are also helpful, including the search function on the website.
 - Request for decision logs to keep members up to date if they can't attend specific meetings.
 - Differing opinions on the detail/level of transcript for meeting minutes. Both detailed minutes and summaries are useful.

- Comment that detailed meeting minutes are sometimes useful for technical and decisional topics.
 - Suggestion to pull out key points from the detailed minutes for documentation purposes.
 - Suggestion for topic-based organization of summaries. For example, there could be a heading that says “structure” with running updates listed under each workgroup relevant to their structure. So, you could see all the decisions, notes, and actions related to one specific topic.
 - Suggestion in the chat to review several months of the existing different WG meeting summaries and develop a template.
 - Suggestion in the chat to save Teams-generated transcripts to save staffer time.
- Reminder that newsletters and recaps are accessible to members and interested parties, so there are already some places where information is collated. It was also suggested that members flag where additional information is useful, since it is not always clear to CWGT staff.
 - Recommendation to create or update new member orientation guides or “Workgroup/Goal Team 101” documents to clearly note scope, purpose, organization, etc.
 - Suggestion to make this into a StoryMap format (or something more usable/upscale), similar to other Clean Water Academy/DEP examples. This could also be the central repository for the information noted above.
 - Additional resources noted: chesapeakebay.net website and introductory meetings with workgroup chairs, coordinators, and staffers.
 - Request for additional exploration on scopes and purposes of the newly formed groups.
 - Support in the chat for revisiting new member orientation guides. Agreement that a “101” primer would also help greatly with prospective members/leadership.
- Request in the chat for a comprehensive monthly brief (on a specified date) summarizing actions across all goal teams. That would also help facilitate cross GT coordination.
 - Support in the chat for the idea of a regular update on the work of the other Goal Teams.
 - Comment that a similar concept used to be compiled for the Management Board called Program Updates.
 - It was noted that not all Goal Teams meet as regularly as us, so a monthly brief may not be necessary.
- Acknowledgement in the chat that an increase in resources to CRC would be needed to support these additional material requests.
- Regarding Clean Water Goal Team membership and the proposed 9 signatory/6 at-large voting member structure for Workgroups:
 - Question on whether or not the slide is saying the Clean Water Goal Team needs 6 new At-Large members.
 - Clarification that we are looking to fill three at-large member positions each year. This year will be a bit different- the three open positions this round will go through the end of 2027, and the other three will cycle off at the end of this year, opening three new positions through 2028.
 - Question concerning continuity. Current members are up to date on Phase 7 Model and other topics, which new nominees might not be as aware of.

Suggestion was made to extend current CWGT membership through 2027/2028 for this reason.

- Response from CWGT leadership suggesting we open nominations to everyone, and this can/should be taken into consideration when the group votes for the nominees to fill these spots.
 - Determination to solicit a call for nominations and request nominees for CWGT At-Large members through July 15th. Nominees will be introduced in July.
- Remark that conforming to the 15 member (9 Signatory/6 At-Large structure) is less critical at the Workgroup level, since the group will still be operating using consensus and under the idea that all meetings are public. A subsequent question was posed regarding the advantage of being an At-Large member on a workgroup you are already interested in and would participate in anyways.
 - Response: The ability to participate in decision-making on things that will formally be moved from the Workgroup to the Goal Team.
 - Opinion provided from a member that it is not necessarily a dealbreaker to not have a 15-member set up, given that not every signatory will participate in every outcome. However, there was acknowledgement that it is important for every workgroup to come up with a decision-making paradigm/structure for how certain decisions will be elevated to the next level.
 - It was noted that the mention of 15 members in the GMF stated “up to” 15. The goal is to mirror the GMF as best we can. If groups can’t do that, they should note to CWGT leadership that they can’t do that and propose an alternate path forward.
 - Clarification requested on the threshold for “not being able to conform” since, in theory, everyone could.
 - Follow-up question posed as to whether or not the Clean Water Goal Team will mandate the 15 member structure.
 - It was noted that if there is a really good reason, that should be articulated to the Goal Team. However, a follow up comment was made that we should be following the new GMF as closely as possible.
- Question as to whether the Clean Water Goal Team should advise the Modeling Workgroup about what they want for the structure, given that they are not currently following the 15 voting member structure.
 - Response that it is critical to have a decision-making framework and clear voting membership for decisions that move forward. It is an expectation that every group make that happen.
 - Follow-up regarding the timeline for conforming and/or if this should be an immediate action.
 - Suggestion was made to bring this up at the July Quarterly Modeling Workgroup meeting.
- Clarification requested as to when the terms will end for leadership of existing workgroups and action teams.
 - Confirmation that there will be a cyclical changing of chairs for workgroups.
- Request for clearly defined definitions of what it means to be a member, voting member, interested party, etc. Concern noted that threshold for 15 member structure may be challenging for the Monitoring and DAR groups.

- Response that it is important to have a defined structure for Monitoring and DAR voting membership, especially as certain items will be elevated to the Goal Team. Similar to Modeling Workgroup, there can be many participants. However, there needs to be a defined voting membership structure.
 - Recommendation that nominations for Monitoring and DAR leadership be solicited through July 15, for subsequent discussion and approval at the July/August CWGT meeting.
- Acknowledgement that an alternate voting structure might need to be sought for the Watershed Technical Workgroup, given the integration of the functions of the FFWG into the WTWG.
- Comment in the chat suggesting that we only need to aim for the 9+6 structure for Goal Teams and/or those groups whose decisions affect policy. Whereas individual WGs, if only making recommendations to the GT, could adopt any decision-making structure that works for them, as long as it's all clearly documented and communicated.
 - Response that it is hard to define what decisions effect policy. Any decision-making or recommendation flowing through a workgroup needs to be clearly documented and defined.
 - Additional request to set a date to reassess if workgroup structure and membership is working.
 - Comment from CWGT leadership that we should start out by doing our best to adhere to what is outlined in the GMF and make suggestions later on.
- Question as to whether or not leadership and coordination/staffing is discussed in the GMF and whether or not there is flexibility in those numbers.
 - Coordination and staffing will not be determined by the Goal Teams/Workgroups. Leadership is defined in the GMF.
 - Comment from a CWGT member that the intent for setting metrics for WG membership and leadership was to adhere to the streamlined charge for the partnership. It is encouraged that the Goal team uses the numbers set forward as a baseline and to aim for that to be the standard. Blanket exemptions shouldn't be applied off the bat.
- Comment in the chat that it is not currently noted in the current member spreadsheet that Sarah Lane as the alternate voting member on the Clean Water Goal Team for Maryland. Request for Caroline and Petra to update/follow-up.
- Curiosity as to how the 15 voting member structure will be applied for the 4D/BORG Action Team, given that there aren't even 15 people joining at times.
 - Confirmation that the 9/6 voting structure does not apply to Action Teams, like BORG or AMT.
 - Acknowledgement that additional discussion on setting standards for membership, formation, and timeline of action teams could take place in the future if needed.
- Comment made to provide clarity to the above chat comment regarding policy. Acknowledgement that previous comments were made with the understanding that decision making would funnel upwards, and the GT would be the decision-making body. Agreement that the important idea is that decisions need to be documented.
 - On Toxic Contaminants specifically, since it is mostly information sharing, it was noted that if the group decides they want to publicly share certain information, that could be an example of a recommendation or

“decision item” coming from Toxic Contaminants Workgroup up to the Clean Water Goal Team.

- Regarding the timeline to convert to the structure, it was the desire of the partnership to have this done by the end of July. Workgroups are encouraged to do that as best as you can. Groups should report back with an update on the timeline. The July 31st deadline was somewhat flexible.
- Notice that calls for nominations for new workgroup leadership and CWGT At-Large will be sent ASAP, with a deadline of July 15th.
- Suggestion that all interested parties should continue to be kept informed/on distribution lists moving forward for the groups that have been moved or sunset.
- Overview of the updated decision-making process resulting from the GMF:
 - Question regarding quorum and whether or not members not in attendance still need to be followed up with via email if the group moves through with a supermajority vote.
 - Clarity requested on what triggers a supermajority vote
 - If dissenting opinions are made and an alternate proposal is not agreed upon, then the group can move to the supermajority voting process.
 - Opinions shared that the consensus rules we are previously accustomed to should be maintained, but a supermajority vote may be critical depending on the timeline needed for a decision. Supermajority was in an effort to avoid an “endless loop” of decision making across multiple meetings without a resolution.
 - Reading of the text from the GMF confirming decision making process and quorum of 2/3 of members.
 - Question posed as to whether or not 2/3 quorum applies to supermajority voting or consent/consensus attempts.
 - Suggestion that members be encouraged to provide their decision in advance if they are unable to make a decisional meeting.
 - Additional context requested on the difference between consent vs consensus:
 - Perspective shared that if no one objects to the question “does anybody object?”, that is considered consent.
 - Additional summary provided that consensus is every single voting member voting in favor of it versus the folks that aren’t around the table don’t object to moving it forward. Acknowledgement that the other new component is that you don’t have to have everyone, you only need 2/3.
 - On the decision-making model continuum, the consent range would be no 1s or 2s. Consensus would be all 5s.
 - Concern shared over the language of the slides indicating call for consent/consensus will happen with 15 members.
 - Comment in the chat confirming:
 - Consensus = All “5”
 - Consent = “3” AND/OR “4” AND/OR “5”
 - Consent also reached informally if nobody raises a “1” or “2”
 - Additional chat comment stating Consensus=agreement, consent=permission
 - Acknowledgement that the goal is still consensus- we still want to reach consensus by everyone. We only get to supermajority if we can’t reach consent after several iterations. The voting is if that ultimately fails.
 - Request (in chat and verbally) for consistency in language between the Governance and Management Framework and the decision-making slide.

- On the topic of identifying which items and level of detail should/shouldn't come to the Goal Team for a decision:
 - Comment that before and after decisions are going to be made, decisions and materials should be posted to the website in advance. Consider including flags to alert Goal Team members of upcoming decisions and/or when materials are posted to support a decision at the Workgroup level.
 - Follow-up comment noting the current ambiguous nature of what needs to rise to the Goal Team for a decision. Request for guidance on what should rise up to the Goal Team level.
 - Acknowledgement of the Phase 7 decision tracker from last year which noted what topics were decisional/informational and at what Workgroup.
 - Comment that a Goal Team member could always flag what should go up to the CWGT for decision making.
 - Remark in the chat that much of this discussion has a basis in trust and the Partnership leadership would be well served in building trust throughout the Partnership membership.
 - Note that the decision-making portions of the GMF that outline what needs to/doesn't need to be elevated does not clearly note technical items or items related to the suite of models.
 - Example shared related to the hydrologic period and material from Robin Glas. There is an exchange of tasking and asking from the CWGT to Robin/MWG, for example.
 - Chat comment suggesting that decisions that have policy implications for federal agencies should also be elevated, especially land-owning federal agencies.
- Pivot in topic to discuss the process for elevating decisions from the CWGT up within the Partnership.
 - Suggestion made that the CWGT should keep the PSC informed of our activities, in the same way that we are requesting the workgroups to inform the CWGT.
 - Comment from CWGT leadership that members should share items they would like to inform the PSC of to Lee and Greg, so that it can be mentioned at future Goal Team Chairs meetings.
 - Suggestion that a high-level overview should be provided consistently on the status of the Phase 7 Model Development.
 - Also include the slide that shows the Phase 7 Model to completion of the RENPS Target #2.
 - Remark that it is also the responsibility of the individual CWGT members to keep their PSC members informed.
 - Additional suggestion to also include project timeline updates and critical deadlines.
- Request to ensure that decisions that have policy implications on federal agencies and specifically land-owning federal agencies also get elevated, not just jurisdictions.
- Question as to whether we will be making our own governance and/or CWGT specific document capturing relevant portions of the GMF.
 - Comment shared that the AgWG and AMT have their own governance protocols. Under the new GMF, is there still a place for these separate governances, or should these be dissolved?

- Response from CWGT leadership that these should be dissolved and we should all be following what is outlined in the GMF.
 - Follow-up question that if exceptions were to be made for membership, where would those be noted?
 - Response that we should do our best to adhere to the GMF as it is written.
- Question related to the work of the LUWG given that they are under a new Goal Team in this updated structure. The Land Use Change model is in development and has implications for Phase 7 Model. Will this be looked at by the CWGT?
 - Note that there is an upcoming office hours to discuss the Land Use Change model.
 - CWGT leadership will bring this up at the Goal Team Chairs meeting to suggestion cross-GIT collaboration.
 - Confirmation that the CWGT will have a say about the Land Use Change Model.
- Current membership lists were shared. Members were asked to review the current membership lists, note changes to signatory membership, people who have retired or should be removed, etc.
 - Comment that the current Hypoxia Collaborative and Data Integrity Workgroup are not included. These will be added in, and the document will be reposted (Item 2.5 in supporting documents field online).

VI. Lunch

VII. Management Strategies: Setting the Stage

Lead: Sarah Brzezinski, EPA CBPO; Jeremy Hanson, CWGT Coordinator

Sarah gave an overview of the expectations and timeline for Management Strategies across the partnership. Jeremy gave an overview of the “worksheets” outcome leads completed for initial considerations for their outcome’s subsection of the CWGT Management Strategy.

Materials: [Demystifying Management Strategies](#), [Overview of Worksheet Responses](#)

Discussion:

- Question posed on the workgroup workplans and whether or not they were distinct from or a part of the Management Strategy process.
 - Acknowledgement that Workgroup workplans should mesh/rollup into the Management Strategy. Items in Workgroup Workplans should support items in Management Strategy. Items in the Management Strategy will be broader to satisfy the target, vs a detailed plan to achieve that in the workplan.
 - Example shared of using BMP Verification Using Satellite Data
 - Management approach: assess the efficacy and adopt an advanced method for BMP verification
 - Workplan: detail activities involved (identifying solutions, testing them, developing methods, approval, etc.)
 - Clarity provided that the work plans are separate because they pick up where the management strategy document will leave off with the management approaches.
- Comment made that the proposed page recommendation for the document is too large. Total length should be discussed and reconsidered by the PSC to ensure accessibility and use.
 - Acknowledgement that 200 pages is still a 50% reduction from the previous documents.

- Sarah walked through key guiding questions for consideration throughout the afternoon. Questions relate to critical challenges, signatory programs currently being implemented, management approaches. It was noted that there will be one compiled request for signatory programs, to streamline the request across goal teams.
- Comment that when looking at Management Strategies, approaches, etc., we should focus on what we can influence and meaningfully tackle as a group. Emphasis on doing a few things well versus doing too many things that are not done well.
- Acknowledgement that six years is a short and ambitious timeframe to coordinate the RENPS and WQ,SAM outcomes together and to bring together modeling and monitoring in the ways that partners have requested.
 - Request from CWGT leadership to have some Modeling Workgroup members participate in the upcoming CAP Action Team (July 13th) meeting to help connect monitoring work to the Model/planning targets.
- Additional challenge shared regarding the wealth of data and information available.
- Statement that our ultimate goal and outcome is “reducing” and things like CESR have identified that our current approach to ag reductions isn’t working. Follow up question - is it the role of this group to identify that challenge?
 - The AgWG could consider evaluating what was put out in Phase III WIPs, what went well and what didn’t, and note what could be improved. That could be something that is tasked to the AgWG.
 - Additional suggestion to have the CWGT and larger Partnership identify opportunities for and encourage innovation. Suggestion that we need the Bay Program to help innovate.
 - Regulatory aspects would need to be addressed in order to integrate innovative practices. The Partnership should be informed of these regulatory hurdles.
 - Suggestion for WTWG to reevaluate the process for integrating new BMPs into the model to make way for this innovation and/or expedite the process for incorporating new BMPs.
 - Chat comments agreeing that steps are needed to open the door for innovation and acknowledging that we have approved BMPs that state agencies won’t approve for credit.
 - Comment that there is currently no pathway for innovation. It shouldn’t be a burden for people to have a higher level of demonstration that what they are doing is working.
 - Response that it is a balancing act with the accountability aspect. If BMPs are thrown into the model where we can’t demonstrate removal efficiencies, credibility may be lost.
 - Remark that we could have a measured load reduction reporting path to account for things like Pay for Success or other things currently being measured and have that translate that into load reduction. This could be something tackled by WTWG.
 - Repeated concern that there are some approved BMPs that regulators won’t accept, so state agencies also have to agree to move forward/credit those BMPs.

VIII. MS: Challenges & Management Approaches Activity

Lead: Jeremy Hanson, CRC; Breck Sullivan, USGS; Keith Bollt, EPA CBPO

Outcome leads shared initial considerations, challenges and management approaches for their respective Outcome. CWGT asked questions and shared feedback during the meeting and via a Mentimeter survey.

- Reducing Excess Nitrogen, Phosphorus & Sediment (RENPS)
- Water Quality, Standards Attainment & Monitoring (WQSAM)
- Toxic & Emerging Contaminants (TEC)

Materials: [Presentation](#), [Compiled Management Strategy Worksheets](#)

Actions:

1. Please provide feedback on the information presented during the Management Strategies session via the [Mentimeter survey](#). For additional reference, feel free to look through the posted [slides](#) and the [compilation of worksheet responses](#). We will close and compile responses from the Mentimeter on July 1st, but we welcome further feedback via email afterwards and continually.
2. Additional workgroup and outcome-level suggestions shared during the Management Strategies session will be compiled and shared with the appropriate leads.

Discussion:

RENPS Outcome

- Chat comment suggesting that one of the RENPS challenges, perhaps not previously identified, is loss of credit from the data transmission process (to CAST).
- Comment in the chat that a key CESR finding was the significant response gaps in our current BMP framework. We often assume these practices are working, but in many cases the evidence is limited; or shows little evidence of success. If we're going to succeed in the non-point source space, we need to identify and develop new approaches, and our existing framework doesn't really provide a place for that work. BMP implementation is full of uncertainty, and there's very little incentive to address that uncertainty—something that needs to change. Opinion shared that we spend a lot of time talking about the implementation gap and very little time talking about the response gap, and that imbalance needs to shift if we want to be successful in the NPS space. Right now, we are heavily slanted to doing more and minimally focused on asking if what we are doing is working.
- Comment in the chat suggesting that to address the science of social marketing in RENPS, in 2024 we talked about focusing messages on the benefits to localities and local quality of life (rather than to the Chesapeake Bay Program) hoping that would build a bigger constituency and accelerate progress.
- Source sector workgroup leads were asked to identify any glaring omissions from the summary of the Management strategy worksheets generated from each Workgroup.
 - USWG leadership noted precipitation should be included and emphasized more.

WQ,SAM Outcome

- Comment agreeing with the importance of clearly communicating that practices in place does not equal full attainment.

TEC Outcome

- Given that the historic indicator for TEC was related to the 303D listings, a question was asked if the group has considered indicators such as stewardship indicators, survey work, assessing heightened education levels/familiarity with issues, etc.

- Acknowledgement in response that we would want to be careful not to take on too ambitious of an indicator and that there might be lessons learned regarding how to measure exchange of knowledge from EPA or elsewhere in the partnership. It was also noted that there are some advantages to maintaining the current indicator. For example, it's a long time series and demonstration of environmental risk reduction as opposed to just documenting the number of meetings.
- Regarding the bullet point that TCW is still missing its hook/mission value add, where is that observation sourced from?
 - It was explained that this was the observation of the Chair and Coordinator, given the changes with the new outcome.
 - Concerns shared with the language of that bullet and why that sentiment wasn't discussed at the time of the Bay Agreement amendments.
 - Those sentiments were raised at the time.
- Question posed to the group by CWGT leadership- what do you want the TCW to work on and/or what would be meaningful for them to provide feedback on?
 - Health and consumption-related trends which might be valuable to the local resident.
 - Will need to avoid being duplicative of state programs.
 - Research on BMPs that would meet the goals of reducing N,P,S as well as Toxics.
 - Seconding of this comment- more concerns have come up in local jurisdictions related to PFAS.
 - Reminder of a Goal Team funded project/STAC Workshop to take a look at this. Could consider a refresher of this given the new outcome.
 - Freshwater Mussel uptake of PFAS or any emerging contaminants- has there been any research done with this? This is of particular importance to PA.
 - It was also noted that there is an effort to stand up the Freshwater Mussels Action Team elsewhere in the Partnership.
- Acknowledgement from TCW chair that the TCW role is to support and empower existing jurisdictional programs. Will be helpful to have feedback, ideas, and priorities outlined from the CWGT on that.

IX. Criteria Assessment Protocol Update

Lead: Tish Robertson, CAP Co-Chair

Tish presented an overview of the decision points and timeline for the Criteria Assessment Protocol Action Team's work to reach a shared understanding from the CWGT.

Materials: [Presentation](#)

Actions:

1. To help greater coordination moving forward, it was requested for someone from the Modeling Workgroup/Modeling Team attend the next CAP meeting on Monday July 13th.
2. At the CWGT July 27th meeting, we will continue to discuss the CAP workplan presented and formally task the CAP Action Team with tasks they outlined in their potential timeline.

Discussion:

- Comment in the chat asking whether "criteria assessment methods" in slide 16 includes both column 2 and 3 in the previous slide.
 - Response that the assessment methods are more encompassing than just the rules on slide 14-15. It also includes the interpolation step, any data formatting needed, etc.
 - Q: Does it include evaluating multiple lines of evidence?
 - A: Yes, the SMLE approach would be considered an assessment method and would lay out the multiple lines of evidence to be considered.
- Question asking when information is received on multiple criteria, does the list specify the criteria or just list if it was deep water/deep channel?
 - Response that the impairment is identified to the designated use and then the cause (DO) would be listed. Comments/narratives describe what criteria were not met. Impairment is tied to designated use.
 - Follow-up question as to whether or not 30-day mean or 7-day mean information would be listed.
 - Information is accessible and graphics are created to show what wasn't attained. However, the more coarse level of identifying which criterion weren't met is not included for the accounting used by EPA.
 - Reiteration that reporting through EPA's database specifies designated use and related causes and it does not detail criteria that are assessed.
 - Remark that it will be useful in the future to specify by 30- and 7-day means.
 - Acknowledgement from the group that only 5 of the criteria have been assessed. In the future, we should be able to assess them all, and it will be more useful to show which ones are meeting attainment and which ones aren't.
 - Given that there is now a wealth of new information, we will need to be specific and clear when synthesizing information.
- Request from CWGT leadership for CAP leadership to provide a timeline at the July CWGT meeting and for the CWGT to task the CAP Workgroup to provide decision rule information on an agreed upon timeline.
- Additional contextual information was provided on the 4D interpolator diagram. It was noted that when we go to set planning targets, the estuarine model would feed inputs into the interpolator. Instead of monitoring data, you would get estuary model output, and that would allow us to take a look at all those scenarios and say whether or not we thought we were attaining DO standards.
- The group was reminded that, in the Day 1 conversations, it was suggested that CAP could help with tiered implementation. Question was asked if that is still on the table.
 - Additional clarity needed on the connection between CAP and tiered implementation.
 - Response that tiered implementation could prioritize low hanging fruit. If we consider the deep water/deep channel criteria to be the high hanging fruit, then migratory fish spawning in nurseries could be the low hanging fruit. The criteria for that use appear to be the low hanging fruit. Could target the use as opposed to the basin.
 - Discussion on opportunity for sub-segmentation could also be useful.

X. Wrap Up

Lead: Lee McDonnell, Greg Sandi, Jeremy Hanson

Lee provided a recap of the day's discussions, noting key points where continued discussion is needed. Open time for reflections and remaining considerations from members occurred.

Discussion:

- Notice to the group that there will be a September hybrid meeting. Potential location suggestions beyond the Annapolis, MD CBPO default were posed:
 - Richmond, VA
 - Fayetteville, WV
- Reminder to refer to CAP as an Action Team, not a Workgroup. Mentions of CAP Workgroup in A&D will be edited to CAP Action Team.

XI. Adjourn

Next Meeting: [Monday, July 27th from 1-4pm](#)

Attendance

Lee McDonnell EPA CBPO (CWGT Co-Chair)
Greg Sandi, MDE (CWGT Co-Chair)
Jeremy Hanson, CRC (CWGT Coordinator)
Petra Baldwin, CRC (CWGT Co-Staffer)
Caroline Kleis, CRC (CWGT Co-Staffer)
Holly Walker, DNREC
Jonathan Champion, DC DOEE
Sarah Lane, MD DNR
Elizabeth Hoffman, MDA
Cass Klingaman, NYSDEC
Scott Heidel, PADEP
Ashley Hullinger, PADEP
Kate Bresaw, PADEP
Kevin McLean, VADEQ
Amanda Shaver, VADEQ
Scott Settle, WVDEP
Dave Montali, Tetra Tech/WVDEP
Marel King, CBC
Suzanne Trevena, EPA R3
Bo Williams, EPA CBPO
KC Filippino, HRPDC
Kevin DuBois, DoW
Joe Wood, CBF
Mike LaSala, LandStudies
Rachel Owrutsky, DNREC
Joseph Schell, DNREC
George Onyullo, DC DOEE
Efeturi Oghenekaro, DC DOEE
Christina Lyerly, MDE
Matt Stover, MDE
Becky Monahan, MDE
Kathy Stecker, MDE

Arianna Johns, VADEQ
Tish Robertson, VADEQ
Tony Timpano, VADEQ
Cynthia Johnson, VADEQ
Norm Goulet, NVRC
Caitlin Grady, GWU
Jamie Mitchell, HRSD
Auston Smith, EPA CBPO
Kaylyn Gootman, EPA CBPO
Lew Linker, EPA CBPO
Eric Hughes, EPA CBPO
Megan Thyng, EPA CBPO
Doug Bell, EPA CBPO
Sarah Brzezinski, EPA CBPO
Lucinda Power, EPA CBPO
Kelly Gable, EPA
Patrick Woolford, EPA
Leah Ettema, EPA R3
Ken Hyer, USGS
Breck Sullivan, USGS
Peter Tango, USGS
Robin Glas, USGS
John Wolf, USGS
Jimmy Webber, USGS
Andy Fitch, USGS
Jackie Pickford, USGS
Angela Jones, DoW
Gabriel Duran, CRC
Allison Welch, CRC
Erin Sonnenburg, CRC
David Wood, CSN
Catherine Krikstan, UMCES

Guido Yactoyano, MDE
Bel Martinez da Matta, MDE
Renee Karrh, MD DNR
Tom Parham, MD DNR
Alisha Mulkey, MDA
Jason Keppler, MDA
Natahnee Miller, PADEP
Tyler Trostle, PADEP
Xander Heidel, PADEP

Rebecca Murphy, UMCES
Eugenia Hart, TetraTech
Jess Blackburn, ACB
Sushanth Gupta, MWCOG
Mark Dubin, VCE
Carl Friedrichs, VIMS
Deni Chambers, NGEM
Pat Thompson

Acronyms

AgWG: [Agriculture Workgroup](#)
AMT: [Agricultural Modeling Team](#)
BMP: Best Management Practice
BORG: [Bay Oxygen Research Group](#)
CAP: [Criteria Assessment Protocol](#)
CAST: [Chesapeake Assessment Scenario Tool](#)
CBLCM: Chesapeake Bay Land Change Model
CBP: Chesapeake Bay Program
CESR: A Comprehensive Evaluation of System Response
CWGT: [Clean Water Goal Team](#)
DAR: [Data, Analysis and Reporting Workgroup](#)
DO: Dissolved Oxygen
E3: Everything, by Everyone, Everywhere
EPA: Environmental Protection Agency
FFWG: [Federal Facilities Workgroup](#)
FMC: Federal Management Committee
GMF: Governance and Management Framework
LRA: Living Resources Assessment
LUWG: [Land Use Workgroup](#)

MEB: Most Effective Basins
METRIC: [Monitored and Expected Total Reduction Indicator for the Chesapeake](#)
PPoW: [Plastic Pollution Workgroup](#)
PSC: [Principals Staff Committee](#)
RENPS: Reducing Excess Nitrogen, Phosphorus and Sediment Outcome
SMLE: States' Multiple-Lines-of-Evidence
STAC: Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee
TCW: [Toxic Contaminants Workgroup](#)
TEC: Toxic and Emerging Contaminants
TMDL: Total Maximum Daily Load
USWG: [Urban Stormwater Workgroup](#)
WIP: Watershed Implementation Plan
WQGIT: [Water Quality Goal Implementation Team](#)
WQ,SAM: Water Quality, Standards Attainment and Monitoring
WTWG: [Watershed Technical Workgroup](#)