

CWGT/WQGIT Decision Vote Tracker - 05/27/26 (via Email)

To what extent do you agree with the approval of the proposed Clean Water Goal Team workgroup structure.

Role	Name	Affiliation	Vote	Notes
Signatory	Holly Walker	DNREC	4	Delaware is a 4, and that's only because I wasn't able to look at this in any more detail.
	George Onyullo	DOEE	4	DC is a "4" at this time in part because of the FFWG discussions to be had. Federal footprint in DC is significant – and we are interested in how FFWG "discussions will play out.
	Greg Sandi	MDE	4	MD is a 4 as long as it's clear there is a relationship between CAP and BORG
	Cassie Davis	NYSDEC	5	
	Scott Heidel	PA DEP	4	Our reservation is: Further discussion is needed regarding the applicability of the FFWG in the future.
	Kevin Mclean	VA DEQ	4	Virginia is registering as a 4 at this time. We appreciate the discussion that has gone into getting the structure recommendations to where they are now, but also recognize there are still more details to hammer out as a GT.
	Scott Settle	WV	4	WV is a 4 with the only reservation being that we think the Federal Facilities workgroup could be folded under the Watershed Technical workgroup but we can live with whatever the end result is on that one.
	Marel King	CBC	4	
	Suzanne Trevena	EPA	4	From a federal perspective we are ok with the proposed structure, with the exception that PPAT/PPoW should be under the CWGT and not under TEC. I think as long as there is wiggle room to revise structure and descriptions based upon feedback and seeing what works, then folks are comfortable to support the proposal, with PPoW under CWGT. If there is agreement on the PPoW placement then we're at a 4. Reservations being the desire to modify things as needed. If there is pushback on the PPoW, then the federal consensus level would change.

At-Large	KC Filippino	HRPDC	4	<p>I would like to note a concern about the voting process. I was surprised that anyone who does not vote by a certain date would automatically be recorded as a 3, I am not familiar with that being an established rule and given that this decision was provided with fewer than four business days for review, I think that approach raises some concerns. The draft structure also changed multiple times with limited explanation, and some of the information requested after last week's meeting was not provided until two days later.</p> <p>I would prefer to vote a 2 but I will vote a 4 in order to avoid delaying progress and because I do think the proposal is, in some respects, a reasonable path forward. That said, I still have several concerns and outstanding questions about how the former STAR groups will function within this new framework, how federal facilities will be incorporated, which CBPO staff members will support these groups, and which groups will be expected to make decisions with voting members versus those that will not.</p> <p>I also remain concerned about how decisions related to modeling and source sectors will be handled. While the Modeling Workgroup has not historically had many formal decisions requiring a vote, there are internal decisions that are often more appropriately made by a source sector workgroup or a Goal Team. The Ag Modeling Team helps provide that pathway for the agricultural sector, but there does not appear to be a similar process for other source sectors unless they are engaged through internal Modeling Team meetings, which are not public.</p> <p>Overall, the limited time for discussion, the compressed schedule, the need for office hours to continue clarifying major issues, and the lack of transparency throughout the process have made this challenging. These workgroups and Goal Teams are the backbone of the partnership, and this reorganization would benefit from clearer expectations at the outset.</p> <p>I encourage you to consider building in a defined time frame to revisit this structure after implementation, particularly if workgroups find that it is not functioning well or if there is evidence that it is not helping the partnership advance the goals and outcomes in the Agreement.</p>
	Joe Wood	CBF	4	
	Emily Dekar	USC	5	
	Kevin Du Bois	DoD	4	I support the structure as proposed in your email.
	Mike La Sala	LandStudies	5	
	Tom Howard	Resolve Hydro		