



Water Quality Goal Implementation Team (WQGIT)

Monday, April 27th, 2026
1:00 - 4:00 PM

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

Purpose: This is the monthly meeting of the Water Quality Goal Implementation Team (WQGIT)/Clean Water Goal Team (CWGT). Meeting topics included updates and discussion on governance, structure and management strategies as well as a discussion on what 2040 means for RENPS Target 2 and a primer on how loads and trends data are determined.

Actions & Decisions

Action: WQGIT/CWGT will be asked to finalize workgroup structure recommendations at the May 18th meeting. If you have questions, comments or concerns on the proposed workgroups, please reach out to Greg Sandi (Gregorio.Sandi@maryland.gov) and Lee McDonnell (McDonnell.Lee@epa.gov).

Action: Current workgroup chairs are asked to provide a draft of workgroup membership and leadership positions to the CWGT for consideration. **Post-meeting note:** Workgroup chairs were asked to send an initial draft of the roster template to Jeremy, Petra and Caroline by **Friday, May 8th**.

Action: CWGT/WQGIT will continue discussions and work on Management Strategy and Workplan development at upcoming meetings, with a plan to have an initial draft Clean Water Goal Management Strategy in August to adhere to finalization of a draft for the PSC by the end of October.

Action: Workgroups are asked to suggest short-, mid-, and long-range objectives for their group to the CWGT for consideration in the drafting of the Management Strategy and Workplan. Please reach out to Greg Sandi (Gregorio.Sandi@maryland.gov) and Lee McDonnell (McDonnell.Lee@epa.gov) with questions or concerns.

Action: CWGT will hear a more detailed presentation on how planning targets were previously set at the May meeting and a more robust discussion at the June meeting. Definitions of methods and a strawman for potential future approaches will be developed in advance of the June meeting to aid this discussion.

Action: If you have any questions on the presentation discussing where loads and trends come from, please reach out to Jimmy Webber (jwebber@usgs.gov) and Jeff Chanut (jchanat@usgs.gov).

Minutes

I. Welcome and Announcements

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

II. Business, Workgroup & Phase 7 Decision Updates

Lead: Jeremy Hanson, WQGIT Coordinator

Jeremy gave an overview of announcements including a reminder on upcoming CWGT Office Hours [May 12](#) and [June 9](#) and an update on the hybrid, two-day meeting for June 22-23 in Baltimore, MD. He noted there may be a second hybrid meeting in August/September to finalize Goal Team decisions. Sarah McDonald, USGS shared that the LUWG will host office hours on April 28th to discuss feedback from the Land Use Time Series Review, the corrections made, and the impact of those corrections. Resources regarding this process are posted [here](#), and the web viewer can be found [here](#). More announcements and updates are on the [posted slides](#) and at the bottom of the [agenda](#).

Materials: [Coordinator Updates Presentation](#), [Land Use Time Series Review Summary](#)

III. Governance and Structure Update and Discussion

Lead: Lee McDonnell, EPA CBPO

Lee McDonnell, CWGT Co-Chair, provided an update on the partnership's structure and governance updates, which will be finalized at the June 30 PSC meeting. Goal Teams have been tasked with providing a recommendation on workgroup structure within the Goal Team by the end of May, along with membership, leadership and staffing as it currently stands. Lee gave an overview of an initial proposed list of CWGT workgroups noting which current groups would remain, change/combine, move to another goal or be eliminated. This includes groups towards all three outcomes under the CWGT and many groups formerly housed under STAR. The proposal includes a distinction between "Implementation" and "Technical Support Workgroups," which members discussed the value, difference, and specific considerations for each.

Discussion on membership included clarification on voting vs. non-voting members, the process for designating primary and alternate representatives, and the need to have more flexibility on the makeup of workgroup membership beyond the 9 signatory and 6 at-large position structure of GT membership. Discussion on workgroup structure included questions on how and with whom these initial proposals were developed and what process other Goal Teams are working under. Specific comments on workgroup suggestions included Land Use Workgroup, Plastic Pollution Action Team, the Integrated Monitoring Networks, Criteria Assessment Protocol and Integrated Trends and Analysis Team.

Materials: [Presentation](#)

Actions:

1. WQGIT/CWGT will be asked to finalize workgroup structure recommendations at the May 18 meeting. If you have questions, comments or concerns on the proposed workgroups, please reach out to Greg Sandi (Gregorio.Sandi@maryland.gov) and Lee McDonnell (McDonnell.Lee@epa.gov).
2. Current workgroup chairs are asked to provide a draft of workgroup membership and leadership positions to the CWGT for consideration. **Post-meeting note:** Workgroup chairs

should send an initial draft of the roster template to Jeremy, Petra and Caroline by **Friday, May 8th**.

Discussion:

- KC Filippino, HRPDC (in chat): Who are the voting members on the membership slide?
 - Lee responded voting members are on the left column, which includes signatory representatives and six at-large members.
- Kevin McLean, VADEQ (in chat): Is there any formal process for designating primary and alternate, or just let chairs/coordinator know?
 - Lee responded there is no formal process. For a specific topic a signatory may want to bring a specific person that doesn't usually attend. Just ensure you notify the staffer/coordinator, so they know who is representing each jurisdiction.
- Kevin McLean asked for more detail on how this strawman was developed and what would happen with the tasks of the Milestone WG and FFWG.
 - Lee responded this was developed in consultation with STAR leadership and internally talking with CWGT Co-chairs. Milestones activities would be taken on by CWGT itself. FFWG discussions have much overlap with WTWG, so considering those activities happening at WTWG.
 - Lee noted that if something doesn't work out in this structure change, then things can always be changed (back) further down the line.
- Amanda Shaver, VADEQ asked for more detail on how the proposal for the groups formerly under STAR was developed.
 - Lee responded it was developed in consultation with STAR leadership including Ken Hyer to see opportunities to streamline and bring things to the forefront for the Goal Team. Lee clarified all STAR workgroups are planned to come under the CWGT.
- Breck Sullivan, USGS (in chat): For a brief description of the scope and purpose of each of the STAR workgroups, you can look at [this link](#).
- KC Filippino asked for more clarity on the timeline and what other Goal Teams are doing.
 - Ken Hyer, HLGT Co-Chair, responded that Healthy Landscapes Goal Team is on the same timeline. They are thinking about leadership, membership (with the same "roster" for voting members"), etc. They have only four workgroups but are a new Goal Team, so their conversations are different. HLGT is meeting [May 11th](#).
 - Lee clarified the deadline for all Goal Teams to submit workgroup structure is May 28th, so we are hoping to reach consensus at the [May 18th](#) CWGT meeting.
- KC Filippino shared appreciation that LUWG moving to HLGT suggests it will grow in scope in the partnership, but emphasized there also needs to be a technical part for data reviews to occur, recommending a technical team be created in the CWGT.
 - Ken Hyer responded that they expect LUWG to still be in close coordination with work in the CWGT. He noted GT Co-Chairs have biweekly meetings and cross-GT technical topics will continue to be brought up there to avoid silos.
- Norm Goulet, USWG Chair, asked if workgroup membership is expected to follow the same 15-member makeup outlined for GT membership.
 - Lee responded it would be great to have the same membership. Going beyond 15 may be hard for decision making.
 - Norm responded USWG also has local government representatives from jurisdictions in addition to at-large members, which is very valuable, so would encourage some flexibility with membership.

- Dave Montali, ModelingWG Chair, commented that ModelingWG is technical and hasn't been focused on voting members. Is the thinking the same for technical vs. Implementation workgroups on membership?
 - Lee responded that can be considered differently, since technical workgroups may be involving more people that aren't jurisdictional representatives.
 - Breck Sullivan (in chat): Agree Dave that the technical workgroups will need to be flexible in the membership and probably different from the implementation workgroups.
- Cassie Davis, NYSDEC confirmed whether the 15 would be voting members and anyone else would be a "participant".
 - Lee responded the 15 refer to voting members. Others could be broken up into non-voting members, invited participants, and the general public if helpful, noting that GTs have non-voting members.
- Keith Bollt (in chat): Do the Clean Water Goal Team chairs have thoughts on who the PPAT would report to if they were moved to the Clean Water Goal Team? The Toxic Contaminants Workgroup or the Clean Water Goal Team? I would lean towards the latter but curious where thinking is.
 - Sushanth Gupta, MWCOG (in chat): Also curious about this.
 - Greg Sandi (in chat): Keith, as part of this discussion...if you want to let us know why you feel PPAT is better under the TCW, please follow up with us.
 - Keith (in chat): Tony the TCW chair and I as TCW coordinator agree with you! Just want to make sure we're on the same page. Sounds like a great glidepath on the future of PPAT.
- Amanda Shaver asked for more detail on the Integrated Monitoring Networks (IMN), given this isn't a group that has met recently.
 - Lee responded the thinking was each of the sub-groups listed would be its own workgroup.
 - Ken Hyer noted that there had previously been a combined monitoring group, but the non-tidal and tidal groups were very different so they were pulled apart over time. It is fair to look at STAR structure to find a balance of groups speaking the same language without having too many specialty action teams. He supported having separate groups for tidal and non-tidal and the five listed under IMN.
 - Breck Sullivan (in chat): After you have had some time to think about it Amanda, we would love your thoughts since you are heavily involved in a lot of these groups!
 - Amanda Shaver (in chat): It may be worth looking at the staffing overlaps for each of the monitoring focused groups to see where we could combine vs maintaining all individual workgroups.
- KC Filippino asked about the difference between implementation vs technical support workgroups and if that is outlined in the GMF.
 - Lee responded this idea came from many groups coming from STAR and wanting to keep separation between the policy and the science.
 - KC responded that it may be adding too many layers or if this is a new concept then they need to be better outlined.
 - Doug Bell, EPA CBPO (in chat): Not certain, but I think it was term I was using to separate membership "requirements". Implementation Workgroups are confronted

with decisions that require a formalized membership structure. As you all were talking through earlier, the Technical Support Workgroups will require flexible membership. Less focused on Voting, Non-Voting (Advisory), all the other participants.

- Ken Staver shared about the function of the AgWG and noted it is technical work, so it may not make sense under the implementation workgroup.
 - Lee responded that he understands the function as both implementation and technical. The distinction is to show technical groups that are not policy-influenced, not that implementation workgroups don't do anything technical.
- Tish Robertson, CAP Co-Chair, shared that she is not strongly opposed to the merging of CAP and ITAT, but noted that her understanding of CAP work is implementation of our regulations. There is a science to coming up with assessment procedures, so it takes knowledge of the criteria but also data science principles. It's different from monitoring.

IV. Management Strategy Update and Discussion

Lead: Greg Sandi, CWGT Co-Chair

Greg gave an overview of the timeline, general work, and potential process for Management Strategy development. Greg shared that they are initially thinking about breaking out workgroup-specific objectives into short-, mid- and long-range objectives to help prioritize work. He ran through some initial ideas for suggestions on what objectives could be for different workgroups within this framework. These suggestions, as well as today's general discussion, are meant to set up general expectations and work will be iterative and ongoing between workgroups and the CWGT.

Discussion included clarifications on the timeline and sequencing of different components, the timeframe the Management Strategy and Workplans are meant to be for (6 and 1-3 years, respectively), how near-term and ongoing activities should be noted in the workgroup objectives, the need for more specifics about tasking to workgroups for writing, the need to distinguish between workplans for outcomes vs. workgroups especially for RENPS, and the need for more flexibility between workgroups.

Materials: [Presentation](#)

Actions:

1. CWGT/WQGIT will continue discussions and work on Management Strategy and Workplan development at upcoming meetings, with a plan to have an initial draft Clean Water Goal Management Strategy in August to adhere to finalization of a draft for the PSC by the end of October.
2. Workgroups are asked to suggest short-, mid-, and long-range objectives for their group to the CWGT for consideration in the drafting of the Management Strategy and Workplan. Please reach out to Greg Sandi (Gregorio.Sandi@maryland.gov) and Lee McDonnell (McDonnell.Lee@epa.gov) with questions or concerns.

Discussion:

- Peter Tango, USGS asked for clarification on the timeline of what we need to have done earlier than December.

- Greg responded that the intermediary steps are being discussed, but potentially a first draft in August and then a final draft before approval by PSC in November.
- Ken Staver shared that some of AgWG’s priority topics go much beyond what is listed on the slides. He added that an assessment of where and why we fell short of Ph III WIPs in many places should be the first priority beyond moving onto things like BMPs from space and soil health.
 - Greg responded that the short-, mid and long-term goals shown are just suggestions and not to tell workgroups how to do their work. The idea with this exercise is to get a sense of groups’ goals and the resources you would need for these activities.
 - Ken added that he thinks the first step at the Goal Team level too should be nailing down all aspects of how you make progress and what it takes in terms of resources and policy to do so.
 - Alisha Mulkey, MDA (in chat): The items on this slide are consistent with recent AgWG discussion. We should take Ken's remarks back to AgWG and present here as a WG.
- Norm Goulet (in chat): Will the workgroups be filling out a template?
 - Lee (in chat): Yes, there is a template for MS and workplans both.
 - Jeremy Hanson (in chat): Templates are on the [April 16 MB page](#) as .docx and possibly posted elsewhere on the CBP site.
 - Sarah Brzezinski (in chat): The approved templates all include "FINAL" in the hyperlink name.
- Norm Goulet (in chat): USWG will not meet again until May 19, one day after WQGIT meeting so whatever is put forward will not have been discussed by the WG.
 - Greg clarified that everything on Management Strategies is for August. May 18 is just for membership and workgroup structure.
- Norm Goulet asked where “core functions” and ongoing tasks that a workgroup does should go in the short-, mid- and long term objectives.
 - Greg responded that it depends on the timeframe you think the work can be done in. We want things that are tangible to show to the PSC.
 - Norm suggested they follow up offline.
- Katie Brownson, USFS, noted that some tasks like E3 Scenario development are set to be done Sept 2026, which would be completed by the time the Management Strategy would be enacted. Where should those go?
 - Greg considered that perhaps things that are too short term should not go in the Management Strategy, then.
 - Norm Goulet noted the review of the E3 output would continue later.
 - Auston Smith, EPA CBPO clarified that the review of E3 outputs is what is being referred to. E3 input discussions are even more short term than that and maybe shouldn't be included.
 - Jeremy Hanson (in chat): It can't hurt to have a few actions already completed on the list, they'll feed into other tasks or actions.
- Breck Sullivan (in chat): Noting how the WQSAM target #4 states now tidal and nontidal trends, so we would want to include in the annual update on the last slide the annual baywide tidal trends.
- KC Filippino asked for clarification on how long these documents last.
 - Sarah Brzezinski responded that the Management Strategies are 6-year documents. Workplans are developed for a 1-3-year timeframe. The intention is to have a 2030 check-in and then a 2033 evaluation.

- Lee noted there are priorities that will go beyond that timeframe as well, which can still be identified and included.
- Greg noted after that duration, a fully new document may not be needed, and an assessment could lead to a revision instead.
- KC Filippino asked if members of workgroups weighed in on the template.
 - Sarah Brzezinski responded that the templates were discussed and worked on by the Management Board since December 2025 and approved at the April MB meeting. I'm not sure about presentations specifically to workgroups. The plan was that feedback would filter into the MB meetings.
- Keith Bollt asked for clarification on expected workgroup support of the outcome-specific portions of the Management Strategy.
 - Lee responded there will be goal team-level objectives and workgroup-level objectives. Some things may be tasked from the goal team that need to be worked on at the workgroup and others may be proposed from the workgroup. We want to make sure the workplans are useful, help drive what we're doing, and have an expectation of delivery to the goal team.
 - Norm Goulet noted that historically workgroups have been more reactionary to topics as the need and interest arises. There need to be more flexibility and a top-down approach will not work everywhere.
 - Greg responded that this is not to limit groups to only what is tasked by the goal team, though for RENPS there are certainly model-related items that need to occur. The purpose of this is to set priorities to help workgroups.
 - Norm noted the governance document suggests everything needs to be approved by the PSC.
 - Lee responded that they want workgroups to propose things and in all likelihood it is supported, but if the Goal Team or PSC sees it as not aligned with the outcome then it might not be supported to be pursued.
- KC Filippino asked about the sequencing of workplan development alongside MS.
 - Lee responded that workplans are not going out for public feedback. Workplan development is more fluid, but should be approved by the Goal Team.
- Katie Brownson (in chat): Would be helpful to distinguish between workplans for outcomes vs workplans for workgroups (that are theoretically tiering to and getting rolled up into the RENPS outcome). If you look at the template the outcome-level management strategy is going to be very high level and may not capture specific workgroup activities.
- Jeremy Hanson noted that it's helpful to look at what is actually in the MS template, which is the document that would go out for public feedback. We don't necessarily have to have everything figured out at the activity/task level at that point in November. Though, we may have a sense of some of those based on ongoing work and challenges we've already identified and documented in past MSs and LAPs.

V. Break

VI. Discussion: What does 2040 mean for RENPS Target 2?

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

Lee reminded the group about what the RENPS outcome and its second Target are and shared key questions and considerations for assessing what the objective should be by 2040 including changing environmental conditions, Conowingo infill, what may be “challenging but achievable”, and what impact a tiered implementation approach may have. Lee also briefly described the past

methods for planning target development and considerations for determining a method for this time.

Materials: [Presentation](#)

Actions:

1. CWGT will hear a more detailed presentation on how planning targets were previously set at the May meeting and a more robust discussion at the June meeting. Definitions of methods and a strawman for potential future approaches will be developed in advance of the June meeting to aid this discussion.

Discussion:

- Dave Montali suggested to keep aiming for 30-day and instantaneous values in the deep channel and when we get closer, we'll understand whether we're going to get all the others. Not sure that tidal fresh areas will be totally dependent upon the upstream watershed. Either way, the work that we're going to be doing in the next 10 to 15 years is still trying to get the practices in place everywhere they're needed. Setting dates far out to 2060 or 2070, for example, is probably disadvantageous. Tiered implementation could be a way to set shorter dates for achieving certain designated uses in certain water bodies. Expanding to all the standards and trying to set targets for all the standards needs a little bit more time to mature.
- KC Filippino (in chat): Is there a description of these options to review?
 - Lee responded this will be prepared before the June meeting. These things don't need to be hammered out immediately, but we do need to figure out a path we're going to go down for our planning target development.
- Tish Robertson, VADEQ noted that there is benefit in VA to understand responses with respect to all of the criteria. The original TMDL was focused on the big three criteria and designated uses. It was a big assumption that those would be protective of the other criteria. The states would benefit from looking at looking at all the criteria, and the level effort needed. Fan of a tiered implementation approach.
 - Lee added that tiered implementation is a new concept and it is going to be a really interested evaluation on how we might do that. Considering it as a way to do the most good along the way to meeting water quality standards.
- Peter Tango, USGS posed a question of whether the seven segments previously determined as the hardest to reach water quality standards are actually the "last seven."
- Joe Wood, CBF (in chat): I would think that trying to sketch out the details for any of these options would be really helpful; because I think there are several decision points that are going to shape how this looks. Dave made a lot of good points; and I think we need to keep that framing, but I think connecting that approach with the tiered approach could be really impactful. In the future, hopefully there can be a straw-man for us to react to; thanks!
 - Lee responded that we will have those concepts sketched out prior to the June meeting.
- Norm Goulet noted David and Peter brought up important points and suggested outside-the-box thinking is needed. We may end up needing some kind of hybrid approach where we have practices in place for various standards or tiers and make the long-term schedule and effort clear to the public.

VII. Where do loads and trends come from?

Lead: Jimmy Webber and Jeff Chanat, USGS

Jimmy Webber, USGS gave an overview of the non-tidal monitoring network (NTN) and how it supports the work of the CWGT and partnership. The objective of the NTN is to compute monitoring-based loads and trends of nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment to inform and guide decision making. It helps to assess water quality goals, evaluate management actions, and calibrate and improve suite of models. Jimmy noted the difference between loads and trends and highlighted that loads are flow-normalized to remove most year-to-year variability with streamflow.

Jeff Chanut, USGS gave an overview of WRTDS (Weighted regressions on time, discharge and season), which is an empirical tool for interpreting water quality data specifically built for CBP to help answer questions about what loads are in specific rivers and how loads change over time in response to management actions.

Materials: [Presentation](#)

Actions:

1. If you have any questions on the presentation discussing where loads and trends come from, please reach out to Jimmy Webber (jwebber@usgs.gov) and Jeff Chanut (jchanat@usgs.gov).

Discussion:

- Kaylyn Gootman, EPA CBPO noted it is great to see the visual of what happens when you add an additional year of data for the Choptank example.
- Dave Montali, WVDEP asked if long-term trends are done in reference to a standard back year.
 - Jimmy responded that the short-term period is defined as 10 year and the long-term trend is anchored in a start year. For most stations it is 1985, but some came online in the years following that so we go back as far as we can.
 - Jimmy noted those decisions were all made with the partnership so there is always room to reconsider how we use and present this data to meet the needs of the partnership.
- Ken Staver, UMD noted he is used to using flow separation techniques to get base flow and storm flow separated. The base flow nitrogen is a huge part of the end load. When you don't do flow separation, you're kind of mixing base flow, which is really different water from storm flow, and that's where the phosphorus is a big deal. We tend to have a lot less storm flow samples and the concentrations are more variable. Wondering about your limitations, especially on estimating storm flow loads.
 - Jeffrey responded that in many cases nitrogen is mobilized at average or low flows, whereas phosphorus has a much steeper relation to its concentration discharge relation. We don't really make any assumptions about the structure of our conceptual model of the watershed in terms of base flow or storm flow. We basically keep it at “what are the data saying”. We take base flow samples and storm flow samples for both. Phosphorus basically travels at storm flow, but we're sort of accounting for that in our empirical framework.
 - Jimmy added that the team takes pretty extreme measures to bracket the observed stream flow conditions with observed samples. We prioritize and target samples, especially if we're measuring something outside of previous flow estimates so we're not getting into scenarios where WRTDS is having to guess at a flow condition it's never seen before.

- Ken posed whether this is our empirical method forever. Considering sampling, if you get more storm samples, then you're automatically going to find upticks in phosphorus concentrations that you predict. We could have a more nuanced discussion with other watersheds.

VIII. Wrap-Up

Lead: Caroline Kleis, WQGIT Co-Staffer

IX. Adjourn

Next Meeting: [Monday, May 18, 2026](#)

Attendance

Lee McDonnell EPA CBPO (CWGT Co-Chair)	Norm Goulet, NVRC
Greg Sandi, MDE (CWGT Co-Chair)	Jamie Heisig-Mitchell, HRSD
Jeremy Hanson, CRC (CWGT Coordinator)	Katie Brownson, USFS
Petra Baldwin, CRC (CWGT Co-Staffer)	Auston Smith, EPA CBPO
Caroline Kleis, CRC (CWGT Co-Staffer)	Kaylyn Gootman, EPA CBPO
Jimmy Webber, USGS	Megan Thyng, EPA CBPO
Jeffrey Chanut, USGS	Doug Bell, EPA CBPO
George Onyullo, DC DOEE	Sarah Brzezinski, EPA CBPO
Holly Walker, DNREC	Keith Bollt, EPA CBPO
Sarah Lane, MD DNR	Lew Linker, EPA CBPO
Cassie Davis, NYS DEC	Tracy Clarke, EPA
Scott Heidel, PADEP	Kelly Gable, EPA
Ashley Hullinger, PADEP	Patrick Woolford, EPA
Kevin McLean, VA DEQ	Ken Hyer, USGS
Amanda Shaver, VA DEQ	Breck Sullivan, USGS
Dave Montali, WV DEP	Peter Tango, USGS
Scott Settle, WV DEP	Sarah McDonald, USGS
Marel King, CBC	Jackie Pickford, USGS
Suzanne Trevena, EPA R3	Coral Howe, USGS
Bo Williams, EPA CBPO	Douglas Moyer, USGS
KC Filippino, HRPDC	Alex Gunnerson, CBPO Contractor
Kevin DuBois, DoW	Maggie Woodward, CBC
Joe Wood, CBF	Melissa Fagan, CRC
Mike LaSala, LandStudies	Gabriel Duran, CRC
Christina Lyerly, MDE	Allison Welch, CRC
Elizabeth Hoffman, MDA	Rebecca Murphy, UMCES
Alisha Mulkey, MDA	Ken Staver, UMD
Dylan Burgevin, MDE	Eugenia Hart, TetraTech
Anne Hairston-Strang, MD DNR	Emily Young, ICPRB
Tyler Trostle, PADEP	Mary Stack, ICPRB
John Lancaster, PADEP	Sushanth Gupta, MWCOG
Arianna Johns, VADEQ	Caitlin Bolton, MWCOG
Tish Robertson, VADEQ	Steven Bieber, MWCOG
Joseph Morina, VADEQ	Liz Chudoba, ACB

Tony Timpano, VADEQ
Bill Keeling, VADEQ
Rachel Owrutsky, DNREC
Cass Klingaman, NYSDEC
Callie Sams, WVDEP

Mark Dubin, Virginia Cooperative Extension
Chris Hartley, USDA
James Shallenberger, SRBC
Tyler Shenk, SRBC
Ellen Egen, Aqua Law
Karl Blankenship

Acronyms

AgWG: Agriculture Workgroup
AMT: Agricultural Modeling Team
BMP: Best Management Practice
CAP: Criteria Assessment Protocol
CAST: Chesapeake Assessment Scenario Tool
CBP: Chesapeake Bay Program
CWGT: Clean Water Goal Team
DO: Dissolved Oxygen
E3: Everything, by Everyone, Everywhere
EPA: Environmental Protection Agency
FFWG: Federal Facilities Workgroup
GMF: Governance and Management Framework
HLGT: Healthy Landscapes Goal Team
ITAT: Integrated Trends Analysis Team
LAP: Logic and Action Plan
LUWG: Land Use Workgroup
MB: Management Board
MS: Management Strategy

NTN: Non-tidal Network
PPAT: Plastic Pollution Action Team
PSC: Principals Staff Committee
RENPS: Reducing Excess Nitrogen, Phosphorus and Sediment Outcome
SAV: Submerged Aquatic Vegetation
STAC: Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee
STAR: Scientific, Technical Assessment, and Reporting
TCW: Toxic Contaminants Workgroup
TMDL: Total Maximum Daily Load
WIP: Watershed Implementation Plan
WQGIT: Water Quality Goal Implementation Team
WQSAM: Water Quality, Standards Attainment and Monitoring
WRTDS: Weighted regressions on time, discharge and season
WTWG: Watershed Technical Workgroup