Chesapeake Bay Program
Science. Restoration. Partnership.

Water Quality Goal Implementation Team (WQGIT)
Monday, January 26th, 2026
1:00 - 4:00 PM

Purpose: This is the monthly meeting of the Water Quality Goal Implementation Team (WQGIT). Meeting topics included critical foundations and background for upcoming deeper conversations related to the RENPS outcome. One decision was sought to confirm two Co-Chairs nominees for the Clean Water Goal Team to recommend to the Management Board, but consensus was not reached during the meeting. A follow-up was sent to WQGIT voting members, and 4 names were put forward to the Management Board for consideration.

Actions & Decisions

Action: If you have questions about any of the upcoming opportunities shared, including serving as a reviewer for NFWF INSR or being a STAC at-large member, please reach out to WQGIT leadership.

Action: The WQGIT heard multiple initial presentations on planning targets, E3/no-action scenarios, tiered implementation, and considerations for future model updates. These conversations will continue at the WQGIT. If you have any further thoughts or comments to share before our next meeting, please reach out to the speakers or WQGIT leadership.

Action: WQGIT and sector workgroups will need to formulate inputs for E3 and No Action scenarios, decide what base year to use for the scenarios, and review Phase 3 WIP scenarios in the next 6-8 months.

Action: If you have input on how often you think the WQGIT should be kept informed about E3 scenario development happening at sector workgroups, please reach out to WQGIT leadership.

Action: If you have questions about the RIM Network Trends or feedback on how these and other monitoring data can be used to inform and evaluate modeling tools, please reach out to Jimmy Webber (jwebber@usgs.gov).

Action: WQGIT leadership will follow-up ASAP about CWGT Co-Chair nominations. **COMPLETED.** **Post-meeting note:** Suzanne Trevena emailed WQGIT voting members on 1/28. The WQGIT will put forward Greg Sandi, Amanda Shaver, Lee McDonnell and herself as the Clean Water Goal Team nominees for co-chairs. These are the four individuals that were nominated by MDE, VA DEQ, EPA, and CBC & MD DNR respectively. The four names were sent to voting members following the meeting, but no vote was held by the WQGIT to either advance or not advance these four people. The Management Board will consider all names submitted at their February 12, 2026 meeting. The MB is the appropriate venue to resolve the concerns heard during the 1/26 WQGIT discussion. Greg and Suzanne will work with the Management Board selectees to ensure a smooth transition to the appointed co-chairs.

Minutes

I. **Welcome and Announcements**
   Lead: Suzanne Trevena, WQGIT Chair

II. **Business, Workgroup & Phase 7 Decision Updates**
    Lead: Jeremy Hanson, WQGIT Coordinator

Jeremy gave an overview of announcements and updates, which are included in either the posted slides or the bottom of the agenda. Jeremy, Petra and Caroline highlighted Phase 7-related decision that have occurred since the last meeting, including the addition of a CSS harvested forest Land Use, approval of feed space methodology and an ongoing decision to finalize the BMP to Load Source mapping. Jeremy announced that the Phase 7 Development Webpage has been updated by Petra, Caroline and the web team to include major additions of past resources, so there is now one site for all Phase 7-related items. More detailed updates from workgroups are outlined on the posted slides.

Materials: Presentation, Oct 2025 – Feb 2026 Phase 7 Decision Planner (version date 1.21.26)

Actions:
1. If you have questions about any of the upcoming opportunities shared, including serving as a reviewer for NFWF INSR or being a STAC at-large member, please reach out to WQGIT leadership.

III. **Foundations for Planning Targets**
     Lead: Lee McDonnell, EPA CBPO

Lee provided an initial overview of the past method and components of how we set planning targets, considerations for setting new targets, and an initial timeline for target development in the coming years. He noted three key partnership principles for setting Phase 6 targets – allocated loads must result in achievement of the states' Bay WQ standards, major river basins that contribute the most to Bay water quality problems must do the most to resolve those problems, and all tracked and reported reductions in loads are credited toward achieving assigned loads. Lee then shared Phase 6 heat maps of Most Effective Basins, which could be important to keep in mind as we consider expanding focus to tiered implementation. Questions and comments included considering where opportunity is instead of just most effective basins, how to use monitoring data most effectively, the impacts of changing environmental conditions on BMP effectiveness, additional principles if a tiered approach is developed, and reporting of BMPs.

Materials: Presentation

Discussion:
- Cassie Davis, NYS DEC asked if the most effective basins (MEBs) will be redrawn.
  - Lee responded the MEBs were solely focused on deep water/deep channel. If tiered implementation occurs, that could shift focus away from MEBs.
  - Cassie proposed to look at where opportunity is in addition to what's most effective, including utilizing information from non-tidal network stations to see where we need to do the most work.
  - Lee responded that one thing that needs to be discussed collectively is how we are going to better use our water quality monitoring data in the future, in general.

- Dave Montali, WVDEP agreed with Cassie's points about MEBs. He added that special case allocations need to be considered for WV and NY, as they were in the past, given the better water quality in headwater states and lack of economic input. This will need to be kept in mind if we go down a new planning target path.
- Kevin DuBois, DoD asked about the impacts of weather on BMP effectiveness.
    - Lee responded that this is part of what is being evaluated. Changing environmental conditions are being looked into for the time period deemed appropriate (e.g. 2050, 2075) and that will be considered in target setting.
    - Lew Linker, EPA concurred with Lee and added that RAND and Carnegie Mellon are looking into BMPs in different physiographic regions to investigate e.g. under CEC what will happen with nutrient management in terms of efficiencies we assign it. We will have initial results from that at the April Modeling WG meeting.
    - James Martin, VA DCR added that since we use the model through a prolonged history, if it is decided that efficiencies have changed from CEC, then multiple efficiencies would need to be kept for each practice to account for different time periods.
- Joe Wood, CBF suggested that a fourth principle should be added if a tiered approach is taken to target setting. Joe referenced places like Tidal Fresh Pamunkey in VA, which is only impacted by a small area so work to improve that segment is very different than others.
    - Lee responded that can be discussed and this is meant as an intro. When looking at planning targets, we have boundaries as to what might impact that segment (e.g. E3 scenarios) and we consider an "outside in" approach to what will satisfy WQ standards and how can we get there. For places like Tidal Fresh Pamunkey, it may be that the only way to solve impairment is in that watershed itself.
- KC Filippino, HRPDC asked what Lee meant by going beyond crediting/reporting and using existing resources.
    - Lee clarified it meant to make sure there was credit given to all activities that were undertaken. Understanding that reporting back to 1995 will become harder the further away we get from that year. Lee further clarified he did not mean that things don't need to be reported, but it could mean reassessing what that reporting/tracking entails, including the usage of satellite data and AI to help identify things on the landscape. This approach could help ease reporting burdens.
    - Norm Goulet, NVRC (in chat) commented: someone will have to explain how the "big eye in the sky" can tell us that something is actually working and maintained.

IV. Preparing Scenarios to Inform Planning Target Development
Lead: Auston Smith, EPA CBPO

Auston gave an overview of what scenarios are needed for setting planning targets, including No Action and Everything, by Everyone, Everywhere (aka "E3") Scenarios. Auston outlined what each scenario is and how they help determine the appropriate context for "controllable loads". Auston shared considerations for developing scenarios for Phase 7 and highlighted the main decisions and tasks that sector workgroups and the WQGIT will need to work on in the coming 6-8 months.

Materials: Presentation

Actions:

1. WQGIT and sector workgroups will need to formulate inputs for E3 and No Action scenarios, decide what base year to use for the scenarios, and review Ph 3 WIPs in the next 6-8 months.
2. If you have input on how often you think the WQGIT should be kept informed about E3 scenario development happening at sector workgroups, please reach out to WQGIT leadership.

Discussion:
- KC Filippino, HRPDC (in chat) asked: Since we haven't heard much about what will happen with workgroups, can your acknowledgement that these decisions should go through source sector workgroups mean we'll probably keep them as part of our governance and structure?
  - Suzanne Trevena, WQGIT Chair (in chat) responded: KC we can't guarantee what will be decided with structure and governance, but there are meetings with GIT leadership/Outcome leads for our input. We are planning to emphasize the importance of our source sector workgroups and the expertise they bring.
- Joe Wood, CBF (in chat) asked: I noticed in the E3 description fertilizer inputs are not included- is that by design or is it that fertilizer inputs are considered controllable (while animal numbers are not)?
  - Auston (in chat) responded: Fertilizer assumptions are being discussed at the Ag Modeling Team and are expected to be finalized by March of this year. The E3 inputs are BMP/technology upgrades and so the fertilizer assumptions within the model will already be ironed out at that time and will be one of the various items (along with animal numbers) that are already on the landscape that will be addressed by these E3 inputs.

V. **Foundations for Tiered Implementation**
Lead: Dr. Kaylyn Gootman, EPA CBPO and Bruce Vogt, NOAA

Kaylyn and Bruce provided an initial presentation on Tiered Implementation and how it could work to help link water quality management decisions to potential improvements in tidal living resource responses. Kaylyn highlighted the motivation for this work, stemming from recommendations from the CESR Report which reconsiders how policy impacts behavior, pollutant loads, then water quality and living resources in conjunction in order to find opportunities to accelerate living resources response in shallow waters while still trying to achieve water quality goals. Kaylyn shared a comparison of our current approach to setting planning targets vs. how tiered implementation could work. Kaylyn shared draft data of the normalized estuarine effectiveness on deep water vs. shallow water for different tributaries to illustrate how it may help identify shallow water areas that might show more impact more quickly. Kaylyn then outlined potential plans for how this could move from concept into implementation.

Bruce presented on the living resources assessment and habitat suitability index, which aims to develop a good baseline on where habitat conditions are suitable and where they're not to help better target where to put water quality and restoration practices in place to have the most impact. They aim to produce a suitability index for each of the 92 tidal segments of the Bay. Bruce and others highlighted the opportunity for this project to spark greater collaboration across Goal Teams and other groups in CBP. Then, Bruce discussed data sets and workflow for the habitat suitability index and presented a mock-up of what a visualization for the index could look like. They are currently working on the model and analysis stage and will begin running scenarios and projections next. Ample discussion followed with considerations from WQGIT members about how this coincides with Phase 7 model development, how this would be applied with current

water quality work, and how it could be most useful. It was noted that the current work builds on existing models and that this work is on a separate track that does not affect Phase 7 development.

Materials: [Presentation,](#) [CESR Report](#)

Discussion:
- Joe Wood, CBF asked how this would impact how we set planning targets if we integrate this approach. Instead of only deep trench, could planning targets be based on the effectiveness of all possible ecological uplift in tidal segments?
    - Kaylyn responded they have been looking at including shallow water and living resources assessments as an additional approach on the default way that jurisdictions could consider. This would likely be a "choose your own adventure" for jurisdictions.
    - Lee McDonnell, EPA added that the focus on deep water/deep channel has included the concept that we are trying to maintain a certain dissolved oxygen level and if we don't then there may be consequences. If we change gears from the default approach, we need to have some boundary conditions to ensure those consequences, like resuspension of phosphorus, don't occur.
- Dave Montali, WVDEP considered how the habitat assessments work into the workings of the WQGIT, including how we plan and how we count things. He is thinking tiered implementation could be multiple planning targets for 92 basins and characterization of effectiveness of those places, and then it would be in the control of the jurisdictions to plan actions first in places where they can get living resource bumps. This may come at the cost of deep channel coming into attainment, though.
    - Kaylyn responded that she's thinking of it as considering where the places are where you might get those other wins along the way to deep water/deep channel.
- Dave asked whether the habitat assessments will indicate which segments are close to having the water quality part be resolved for the sake of living resources to tell jurisdictions about the areas where a small water quality improvement could have a big living resources effect.
    - Bruce responded that they hope to be able to isolate things that are more important drivers of living resources, including things that are in management control (e.g. nutrients). When they get into the scenario planning, those are some of the things they might be able to look at once they have the habitat suitability index and can potentially make projections.
    - Kaylyn noted these are questions to continue having, and this is just an introduction to start thinking about this at the WQGIT.
- James Martin, VA DCR shared that from the context of tiered implementation in our water quality efforts, what is most important is that the habitat suitability index tell us where influences in water quality components would bring it back to a much higher level of habitat suitability. If we want to have tiered targets with some of those based on shallow water and e.g. migratory fish spawning area designated uses, then we should set that up so we can see what level of water quality attainment of load reduction would be needed to meet those designated uses. This kind of tiering could give us a better understanding of the original assumption that achieving attainment in deep water/deep channel will lead to attainment elsewhere. Some of those shallow areas may be in fact harder to meet dissolved oxygen under future climate conditions than the deep channel.
- Kristin Saunders, MD DNR (in chat) noted: As you consider how to prioritize or include this living resources habitat suitability, it might be really helpful to convene joint meetings with whatever team is stood up to handle fisheries and habitat. Having WQ do

this work alone and potentially in a silo would be a lost opportunity to bring colleagues in while you consider this through joint meetings or workshopping going forward. Going individually to each goal team is not efficient and it loses a lot of subject matter expertise. Just a friendly suggestion to how you do this differently.

- o Kaylyn responded that they really see this as a great collaboration between clean water, fish, habitat, STAC and others. Bringing minds together and getting this sorted about how we could do things differently will be important.
- Cassie Davis, NYS DEC asked (in chat): Will this work be considered part of the Phase 7 Model Development? It would be helpful to see updates on the phase 7 model development page.
    - o Lee responded (in chat): This effort is running separate but parallel to P7. One of the results is informing, which we are talking about now is tiered targets, and how this will inform them
- KC Filippino, HRPDC asked about the relation between this and the Phase 7 model.
    - o Lee responded that they are using the same water quality data, but the fish data aren't a part of the Phase 7 calibration.
    - o KC asked how/if they are informing each other if they are being developed on different timeframes.
    - o Kaylyn responded that the habitat suitability study is bringing together the water quality pieces, the fish pieces, and the habitat pieces. So, the fish and habitat pieces are not part of the Phase 7 model data, but they will be able to inform planning targets down the road.
    - o KC responded that how we interpret this at the same time we're trying to interpret and develop targets will be key. Looking forward to more of this coming to the WQGIT.
- James Martin asked (in chat): Do you anticipate adoption of new BMPs that drive habitat or LMR response or are we really talking about using existing WQ BMPs geographically targeted to influence WQ impact in the desired habitat/LMR area?
    - o Lee responded (in chat): I think this is open for discussion, but part of it will focus on geographic BMPs to impact dissolved oxygen.
- Kevin DuBois, DoD noted (in chat): I think one of the most important outcomes of tiered implementation is the building of a stronger constituency among the public to facilitate the future improvements (DWDC) they cannot see or easily detect.
- Norm Goulet, NVRC asked (in chat): How are non-implemental factors, such as temperature, going to be factored in?
    - o Kaylyn responded (in chat): For sure as a part of the VIMS modeling and the various scenarios they run to get to the habitat suitability index.

VI. Break

VII. River Input Monitoring (RIM) Network 2024 Trends
Lead: Jimmy Webber, USGS

Jimmy provided a brief presentation of nitrogen, phosphorus and suspended sediment loads and trends measured from the Chesapeake Bay River Input Monitoring (RIM) Network through water year 2024. Jimmy highlighted long-term and short-term trends for each, and noted an effort to assess the impact of watershed loads on tidal water quality. USGS plans to update this information for the 9 RIM stations and full 123 station network with loads and trends through water year 2025 later this year.

Materials: Presentation, Results Summary, Fact Sheet

Actions:
1. If you have questions about the RIM Network Trends or feedback on how these and other monitoring data can be used to inform and evaluate modeling tools, please reach out to Jimmy Webber (jwebber@usgs.gov).

Discussion:
- James Martin, VA DCR asked about flow-normalized load and that process considering CEC changing loads.
  - Jimmy responded the model they use is WRTDS (Weighted Regressions on Time, Discharge, and Season). The model was developed in 2010 with the assumption that flow will be stable over the period of trend. WRTDS has evolved a technique to relax that assumption and they also run a trend and stream flow to see how stable the trend records are. Even at stations where flows are not very stable, they've used an updated version of WRTDS to compare what the impact would be on trends and the impact is very minimal.
- Kevin DuBois, DoD asked (in chat): Are you looking at the TP trends relative to the occurrence of harmful algal blooms in tidal waters?
  - Jimmy responded (in chat): I can pass that question on to the tidal water-quality monitoring team. For nontidal waters, we have seen more HABs in some localized areas. But those blooms might not be a wide-spread driver of nontidal P across the watershed.
  - Kaylyn responded (in chat): I can bring this question to ITAT and see if anyone has been looking at this, and we can look to have this as an agenda item at a future meeting. Would be great to have a discussion with our tidal trends team, fed, and state partners who are working on HABs. Thinking of a few at MD DNR to start.
- Kevin Mclean, VADEQ asked (in chat): This was a great presentation, Jimmy! For river basins inclusive of smaller watershed (such as the James and Appomattox), is James data inclusive of the entire basin or does it exclude/separate the Appomattox portion?
  - Jimmy responded (in chat): The 9 RIM stations are non-overlapping. The James is monitored at Cartersville, VA and the Appomattox is monitored at Matoaca, VA. So, each monitored station represents conditions in the entire upstream area. I'd probably describe the James River RIM station as inclusive of the upper and middle James, whereas the lower James is the area below the fall line. You can explore an interactive map of the nontidal monitoring stations on this website.

VIII. **Future Model Updates**
Lead: Lee McDonnell, EPA CBPO

Lee briefly shared questions for the WQGIT to discuss at future meetings about future model updates including how frequently to incorporate new data and methods, what considerations should drive this process, how decision making could improve to provide more certainty for planning and improvements to simplify communications. Lee highlighted the different considerations between model phase changes (i.e. when Phase 8 should occur) and version updates (i.e. regular updates to inputs and CAST within Phase 7). Lee provided context for previous decisions and recent development frequency through Phase 6, and listed further

considerations for determining update frequency for Phase 7. Discussion included comments on the usefulness of having a sense of what has slowed us down in the past and consideration of how to separate CAST version updates from the ability to add new BMPs more frequently.

Materials: [Presentation](#)

Discussion:
- Kevin McLean, VADEQ commented that it will be useful having a sense of what has slowed us down in the past to see how to remove those barriers in the future. It feels like we are always working on the next phase of version development. Kevin proposed exploring separating updates to the model/revisions to CAST from the process of adding new BMPs.
    - Lee responded that CBPO is looking into how that separation could occur to allow new BMPs into the model without making a data change, since that seemed to be the driving force for having frequent version updates to CAST.
    - Kevin asked if the ability to report net nitrogen and phosphorous reductions into CAST instead of a specific BMP type has been considered.
    - Lee responded, not representing EPA but his own thoughts, that if there is something we have measured and we have a good handle on that, we should figure out how to introduce that.
- James Martin, VADCR noted that if Phase 7 begins to be used in 2030 he hopes it can be in place through the 2040 time horizon for the agreement. But even with that, we will have to start thinking about Phase 8 soon because a phase change has been a 6-7 year activity. For the updates to CAST versions, James agrees with Kevin that fewer updates would be helpful. If we can find a way to make version updates only when we have new ag census and land use data and find ways to add BMPs on a running basis when they are approved, that would be good.

IX. **Clean Water Goal Team Co-Chair Nominations**
Lead: Jeremy Hanson, WQGIT Coordinator

Suzanne set the stage for the process for Co-Chair nominations for the CWGT. Jeremy introduced the two jurisdictional nominations for Co-Chair, Amanda Shaver (VADEQ) and Greg Sandi (MDE), who each introduced themselves briefly. Jeremy summarized results from the pre-meeting poll from WQGIT voting members – both jurisdictional nominees had consensus support and there was a slight preference for Greg if forced to choose one. Jeremy suggested both names be put forward to the Management Board for consideration of a jurisdictional Co-Chair; there was support for this approach but a decision was not confirmed since members wished to discuss the federal nominations first.

There was ample discussion on how best to proceed, given that the name of the federal nominees had not been shared. It was pointed out that the Management Board had not decided that it must be one federal and one jurisdictional co-chair, though that was the initial direction provided to Goal Teams, and perhaps the CWGT could nominate Greg and Amanda for the two co-chair positions. Discussion also included questions about why the name of EPA's nominee(s) could not be shared and who was responsible for determining a federal nominee. It was clarified that there were two nominations who happened to be EPA folks, but they were not necessarily both

nominated by EPA. Multiple members shared discomfort with voting or putting forward nominees to the Management Board without knowing the specific person, not just their affiliation. The WQGIT could not reach consensus and Suzanne proposed to follow up with members ASAP once the federal nominee could be resolved and shared.

Materials: [Nominee Bios](#), [Position Description](#)

Actions:
1. WQGIT leadership will follow-up ASAP about CWGT Co-Chair nominations. COMPLETED. **Post-meeting note**: Suzanne emailed WQGIT voting members on 1/28. The WQGIT will put forward Greg Sandi, Amanda Shaver, Lee McDonnell and herself as the Clean Water Goal Team nominees for co-chairs. These are the four individuals that were nominated by MDE, VA DEQ, EPA, and CBC & MD DNR respectively. The four names were sent to voting members following the meeting, but no vote was held by the WQGIT to either advance or not advance these four people. The Management Board will consider all names submitted at their February 13, 2026 meeting. The MB is the appropriate venue to resolve the concerns heard during the 1/26 WQGIT discussion. Greg and Suzanne will work with the Management Board selectees to ensure a smooth transition to the appointed co-chairs.

Discussion:
- Kevin McLean, VADEQ noted that the Management Board clarified at their meeting on Jan 15 that the initial announcement requiring one jurisdictional and one federal co-chair should be more of a suggestion. So, short of not knowing who the EPA nominee is, he would suggest putting Amanda and Greg forward as the two nominees for the chairs. Don't think we need to have a fed and a jurisdictional representative necessarily.
  - KC Filippino, HRPDC shared support for this.
  - Jeremy responded that if we put forward both names, it doesn't necessarily restrict us to sticking to that one-and-one mold. I'd say that'd be up to the management board to determine what model they want to stick to as far as the balance of the Co-chairs and where they're affiliated with.
- Kevin DuBois, DoD shared support for putting both Amanda and Greg forward and also asked (in chat): Just the EPA assess the federal nominee or the whole federal family assess the federal nominee? Ask the FOD?
- Marel King, CBC clarified if both Amanda and Greg would be put forward as co-chairs? It is confusing since we haven't discussed the federal nominee yet.
  - Suzanne responded that there were two nominees both affiliated with EPA so they wanted to give the federal agencies the opportunity to again consider who they would want to put forward as a nominee. Because the timeline was so truncated and fast, we want to make sure that we're consulting with everybody before we start putting names out for folks.
  - KC suggested that WQGIT could put forward the two co-chairs from the jurisdiction. And then if they decide who the EPA nominees would be, could we get a quick consensus poll out?
- Kevin McLean clarified whether we don't know who the EPA nominee is today because EPA hasn't decided between the two people who were nominated.

- o Suzanne responded yes, we will share prior to sending something to the management board, we just haven't had a chance to talk internally.
    - o Kevin McLean noted that perhaps it is getting ahead of things putting other names forward if we still don't know who the other potential nominee(s) are.
    - o Jeremy recognized the difficulty with the tight turnaround time. He noted the deadline to provide consensus or lack of consensus outcome results is this Wednesday. Maybe we can fudge that a little bit.
    - o Kevin DuBois commented he didn't understand why only EPA would have a vote on who the federal representative is. Wouldn't that be subject to the broader federal family? Suzanne responded she thought that discussion occurred. Kevin responded he wasn't aware of it happening.
- Marel clarified that there were two nominations, they just both happen to be EPA folks. They were not necessarily both nominated by EPA. She shared that CBC nominated someone.
    - o Sarah Lane, MD DNR shared (in chat) that MD also nominated someone from EPA.
    - o Kevin DuBois asked (in chat): Is there a reason we can't know the names of the EPA nominees?
    - o James Martin, VA DCR asked (in chat): Marel and Sarah, please share the names of your nominees so the WQGIT can take a poll today and advance 1 or more nominees.
- Norm Goulet, NVRC shared he doesn't see how we can put forward a consensus vote when we don't even know the two people we are voting for. If we are submitting a consensus, he suggested we put forward the two jurisdictional names and that's our consensus. Confused why the federal agencies are being given a guaranteed spot.
    - o Suzanne responded that her understanding was there were discussions at FOD for federal representatives that were being put forward and then there was an additional EPA name put forward so they want to give more time for folks to think about it. Ultimately, it's a management board decision.
    - o Norm responded that this is a consensus recommendation from WQGIT, and without knowing all the nominee names, it seems very difficult to call this a consensus vote.
    - o Suzanne responded that she would follow up ASAP following this meeting to see what we can do and try to give members a couple days to weigh in. She shared appreciation for everyone's patience and willingness to work with us on this.

X. Clean Water Goal Team Planning Horizon
Lead: Jeremy Hanson, WQGIT Coordinator

Given the meeting had already run over time, Jeremy gave a very brief verbal update on upcoming priorities for the WQGIT and reminded the group there is still a plan to hold a CWGT hybrid meeting in April. More details, including on partnership plans for structure/governance changes and management strategies development, are shared in the posted slides. More detailed information is available on the January 15 MB and January 22 PSC meeting pages, e.g., about management strategies or the governance management framework drafting plan. Jeremy may go over these items in the next meeting. Please reach out individually with questions or suggestions.

Materials: Presentation

XI. **Wrap-Up**
Lead: Petra Baldwin, WQGIT Co-Staffer

XII. **Adjourn**

Next Meeting: Monday February 23rd, 2026

Attendance

Suzanne Trevena, EPA (WQGIT Chair)
Greg Sandi, MDE (WQGIT Vice-Chair)
Jeremy Hanson, CRC (WQGIT Coordinator)
Petra Baldwin, CRC (WQGIT Co-Staffer)
Caroline Kleis, CRC (WQGIT Co-Staffer)
Holly Walker, DNREC
George Onyullo, DC DOEE
Sarah Lane, MD DNR
Cassie Davis, NYS DEC
Scott Heidel, PADEP
Kevin McLean, VA DEQ
James Martin, VA DCR
Dave Montali, WV DEP
Scott Settle, WVDEP
KC Filippino, HRPDC
Emily Dekar, Tioga Co., NY
Kevin DuBois, DoD
Joe Wood, CBF
Marel King, CBC
Mike LaSala, LandStudies
Lee McDonnell, EPA
Kaylyn Gootman, EPA
Bruce Vogt, NOAA
Jimmy Webber, USGS
Dylan Burgevin, MDE
Sabine Miller, MDE
Christina Lyerly, MDE
Alisha Mulkey, MDA
Kristin Saunders, MD DNR
Anne Hairston-Strang, MD DNR
Bailey Robertory, MD DNR
Ashley Hullinger, PADEP
Bruce Naylor, PADEP
Kathryn Beats, PADEP
Erin Vesey, PADEP
John Lancaster, PADEP

Callie Sams, WVDEP
Maggie Woodward, CBC
Angela Jones, DoD
Norm Goulet, NVRC
Jamie Mitchell, HRSD
David Wood, CSN
Tony Timpano, VA DEQ
Amanda Shaver, VA DEQ
Arianna Johns, VADEQ
Katie Brownson, USFS
Bo Williams, EPA
Lew Linker, EPA
Auston Smith, EPA
Eric Hughes, EPA
Megan Thynge, EPA
Keith Bollt, EPA
Kelly Gable, EPA
Alex Gunnerson, CBPO Contractor
Breck Sullivan, USGS
Coral Howe, USGS
Carly Maas, USGS
Jess Blackburn, ACB
Laura Cattell Noll, ACB
Eugenia Hart, TetraTech
Allison Welch, CRC
Christina Garvey, CRC
Steven Bieber, MWCOG
Sushanth Gupta, MCWOG
Olivia Martin, Devereux Consulting
James Shallenberger, SRBC
Terra Famuliner, RVARC
Ellen Egen, Aqua Law
Jessica Shippen-Hansen, TJSWCD
Anne Coates, TJSWCD
LH

Acronyms

BMP: Best Management Practice
CAST: Chesapeake Assessment Scenario Tool
CBP: Chesapeake Bay Program
CEC: Changing Environmental Conditions
EPA: Environmental Protection Agency
FOD: Federal Office Directors
HAB: Harmful Algal Bloom
ITAT: Integrated Trends Analysis Team

MB: Management Board
MEB: Most Effective Basins
NRCS: Natural Resources Conservation Service
PSC: Principals' Staff Committee
RIM: River Input Monitoring
WIP: Watershed Implementation Plan
WQGIT: Water Quality Goal Implementation Team
WRTDS: Weighted Regressions on Time, Discharge, and Season