

FEG Recommendations (PSC Decision #2)				
Role	Member	Affiliation	Vote	Notes
Signatory Members	Chris Brosch	DE	STAND ASIDE	
	George Onyullo	DC	ENDORSE	
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Alternative datasets were not as thoroughly explored given time constraints of initial proposed schedule -- available data addresses latency issue</li> <li>- Parallel discussions in AMT have revealed other concerns with data inputs that would be addressed in Phase 7, so concerns about why to proceed to "fix" portions now - plugging updated data into broken equation. Should wait to evaluate holistically.</li> <li>- Updated fertilizer sales data suggests a significant increase in volume, that is not substantiated by other production information. When included into CAST methods, nitrogen loads from ag increase accordingly.</li> <li>- Concerns about messaging: meaningful implications to the agricultural sector, both in perception of their progress and in engaging the sector to achieve future nutrient reductions. No communications plan at this time</li> </ul>
	Dinorah Dalmasy	MD	STAND ASIDE	
	Lauren Townley	NY	AGREE W/ RES	
	Jill Whitcomb	PA	STAND ASIDE	Requests that timing application of nutrients be reevaluated in P7.
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The short timeline for FEG P6 recommendation combined with P6 data consistency concerns precluded a robust search and evaluation of alternative data sources. Phase 7 should allow a more comprehensive consideration of alternative lines of evidence and data.</li> <li>- There are still unanswered concerns with significantly increased nitrogen loading projections in the Bay watershed compared with national trends. While this is what the data depicts, it still seems out of balance (roughly 20% increase for Bay watershed vs 1.3% nationally).</li> </ul>
	Bryant Thomas	VA	AGREE W/ RES	
	Scott Settle	WV	ENDORSE	
	Marel King	CBC	ENDORSE	
	Lucinda Power	EPA	ENDORSE	
At-Large Members	KC Fillippino	HRPDC	STAND ASIDE	
	Joe Wood	CBF	STAND ASIDE	
	Jeffrey Cornwell	UMCES	ENDORSE	
	Emily Dekar	USC	AGREE W/ RES	
	Mike LaSala	LandStudies	AGREE W/ RES	
	Kevin DuBois	DoD	ENDORSE	confirmed via email

CAST Review Process / Illogical Results (PSC Decision #3)				
Role	Member	Affiliation	Vote	Notes
Signatory Members	Chris Brosch	DE	ENDORSE	
	George Onyullo	DC	ENDORSE	
	Dinorah Dalmasy	MD	AGREE W/ RES	
	Lauren Townley	NY	ENDORSE	
	Jill Whitcomb	PA	AGREE W/ RES	No plan for independent, unbiased, third party review
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The recommended process would not be implemented until Phase 7 model tools are available. So, the timing of this recommendation may not address the PSC charge as that is thought to be relevant to Phase 6. If the intent was to improve CBPO processes, documentation and QC, the process largely transfers that responsibility to the model reviewers to identify any resulting anomalous results.</li> <li>- It is unclear who will make the determination of "scientifically validated" anomaly/illogical output.</li> <li>- Ultimately the process can still result in a stalemate, workgroups continuing to work toward solution in perpetuity while reverting to previous model data and methods.</li> <li>- The process seems ambitious given the recent history of CAST reviews.</li> </ul>
	Bryant Thomas	VA	AGREE W/ RES	
	Scott Settle	WV	ENDORSE	
	Marel King	CBC	ENDORSE	
	Lucinda Power	EPA	ENDORSE	
At-Large Members	KC Fillippino	HRPDC	AGREE W/ RES	Reservations because sticking to a schedule isn't the partnership's strong suit, it's ambitious and likely unintended consequences will still crop up. There's no built in flexibility and as James said, this isn't really applicable until Phase 7.
				I think a review process is helpful and has benefit if this is the way we are going to operate; but I also don't think that the best solution to the situation we've found ourselves in with fertilizer data and other illogical results, is yet another watershed model review process. I think there will always be illogical results that are unexplained- particularly with the data sets we work with, and I'm not sold that will be addressed as soon as we get to phase 7. The solution I'd prefer, and I think is called for in CESR, is to de-emphasize the role of the model in our work and focus more directly on documenting the outcomes of management actions; The model doesn't have to be 'perfect' if we don't live and die by it; I think we'd be better off focusing on directly quantifying the effectiveness of our management effort.
	Joe Wood	CBF	STAND ASIDE	
	Jeffrey Cornwell	UMCES	ENDORSE	
	Emily Dekar	USC	ENDORSE	
	Mike LaSala	LandStudies	AGREE W/ RES	Reservation is related to the fact that everything has pro's and con's. Generally we can envision both the pro's and con's to a certain degree with an elected approach. My issue is I can't seem to identify or truly visualize any "large" con's...and sometimes when that happens, the con's are a big bad angry bear hiding in the shadows. I could be wrong, and I am simply over-thinking it...but cannot shake that feeling.
	Kevin DuBois	DoD	STAND ASIDE	confirmed via email

CAST Phase 6 Updated Schedule (Option 1: C23 final version for P6)				
Role	Member	Affiliation	Vote	Notes
Signatory Members	Chris Brosch	DE	STAND ASIDE	
	George Onyullo	DC	AGREE W/ RES	
	Dinorah Dalmasy	MD	AGREE W/ RES	
	Lauren Townley	NY	AGREE W/ RES	
	Jill Whitcomb	PA	AGREE W/ RES	
	Bryant Thomas	VA	ENDORSE	
	Scott Settle	WV	ENDORSE	
	Marel King	CBC	AGREE W/ RES	Prefer Option 2 but can live with Option 1.
	Lucinda Power	EPA	ENDORSE	
At-Large Members	KC Fillippino	HRPDC	STAND ASIDE	
	Joe Wood	CBF	STAND ASIDE	concerned about doing the 2025 evaluation not using the most up-to-date data
	Jeffrey Cornwell	UMCES	ENDORSE	
	Emily Dekar	USC	AGREE W/ RES	
	Mike LaSala	LandStudies	STAND ASIDE	
	Kevin DuBois	DoD	STAND ASIDE	confirmed via email

Animal Mortality BMP Technical Appendix				
Role	Member	Affiliation	Vote	Notes
Signatory Members	Chris Brosch	DE	AGREE W/ RES	
	George Onyullo	DC	ENDORSE	
	Dinorah Dalmasy	MD	ENDORSE	
	Lauren Townley	NY	ENDORSE	
	Jill Whitcomb	PA	ENDORSE	
	Bryant Thomas	VA	ENDORSE	
	Scott Settle	WV	ENDORSE	
	Marel King	CBC	ENDORSE	
	Lucinda Power	EPA	ENDORSE	
At-Large Members	KC Fillippino	HRPDC	ENDORSE	
	Joe Wood	CBF	STAND ASIDE	confirmed via email
	Jeffrey Cornwell	UMCES	ENDORSE	
	Emily Dekar	USC	ENDORSE	
	Mike LaSala	LandStudies	ENDORSE	
	Kevin DuBois	DoD	STAND ASIDE	confirmed via email

Removal of Wetland Credit Durations				
Role	Member	Affiliation	Vote	Notes
Signatory Members	Chris Brosch	DE	AGREE W/ RES	
	George Onyullo	DC	AGREE W/ RES	
	Dinorah Dalmasy	MD	AGREE W/ RES	
	Lauren Townley	NY	ENDORSE	
	Jill Whitcomb	PA	ENDORSE	
				Fully support the first sentence of the recommendation. The second half of the BMPVAHAT recommendation pertaining to revisiting the credit durations if/when technology becomes available to do so conflates two separate issues. The primary purpose and recommendation of the group appears to focus on removing the limitation on credit duration for wetland BMPs. The second half of the recommendation deals with the issue of tracking losses/gains of wetlands which is a separate issue from the reporting and verification of wetland BMPs. Tracking losses/gains is more focused on trends which may or may not have anything to do with the installation and crediting of BMPs.
	Bryant Thomas	VA	AGREE W/ RES	
	Scott Settle	WV	ENDORSE	
	Marel King	CBC	AGREE W/ RES	
	Lucinda Power	EPA	ENDORSE	
At-Large Members	KC Fillippino	HRPDC	AGREE W/ RES	
	Joe Wood	CBF	AGREE W/ RES	
	Jeffrey Cornwell	UMCES	AGREE W/ RES	
	Emily Dekar	USC	ENDORSE	
	Mike LaSala	LandStudies	ENDORSE	
	Kevin DuBois	DoD	ENDORSE	confirmed via email