



Watershed Technical Workgroup

September 3, 2026

10:00AM-12:00PM

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

Purpose: This is the monthly meeting of the Watershed Technical Workgroup. Agenda topics included relevant announcements, a continued discussion on voting membership structure and process, an update on the Expert Panel Protocol revisions, and an overview of an upcoming task to investigate the frequency of model updates.

Summary of Actions & Decisions

Decision: The WTWG approved the August 2026 Meeting Minutes.

Action: The CBP NEIEN Node has been decommissioned as of August 31, 2026. For more information, the WTWG is encouraged to view the [FAQ presentation](#) and reach out to Megan Thyng (Thyng.Megan@epa.gov), Raj Bojja (rbojja@chesapeakebay.net), and Jess Rigelman (jrigelman@j7llc.com) with any questions.

Action: Suzanne Trevena, EPA, informed the WTWG that there was a delay in the posting of the EPA Milestones evaluations, pending remaining approval. Please reach out to Suzanne (trevena.suzanne@epa.gov) with any remaining questions.

Post Meeting Note: The EPA 2025 Assessment and EPA Evaluations of 2024-2025 Milestone Progress and 2026-2027 Milestone Commitments were posted on September 14th. You can access them [here](#).

Action: Auston Smith, EPA, will reach out to jurisdictions with a poll to schedule verification calls between December 14-18th.

Post Meeting Note: Auston contacted jurisdictions/reporting contacts on 9/17. Please fill out the WhenisGood poll by 9/25 and a meeting will be scheduled accordingly.

Action: The [TMDL Tracking and Reporting Contact list](#) has been updated and will be posted to CAST. Please look over this list and provide any edits to Auston Smith (Smith.Auston@epa.gov).

Action: The call for nominations for WTWG at-large member positions will be extended ahead of the October meeting. Those interested in nominating themselves or others for the open positions should reach out to Caroline Kleis (Kleis.Caroline@epa.gov) and Auston Smith (Smith.Auston@epa.gov).

Post Meeting Note: The call for nominations was extended to 9/17. No additional nominations were received by this date. As such, the WTWG will vote on the approval of the nominations received (Kevin Du Bois, DoW, and Karl Wilson, USDA) at the October WTWG meeting.

Action: A draft of the revised Expert Panel Protocol will be sent to the WTWG for review, ahead of the October WTWG meeting. WTWG members are asked to review this draft and provide feedback in advance of October 1st for discussion at the October meeting.

Post Meeting Note: This draft was distributed by Auston Smith (Smith.Auston@epa.gov) on 9/17. You can access the draft [here](#). A summary of comments received will be shared with the WTWG at the October meeting.

Action: The CWGT directed the WTWG to develop options for when to update CAST and to present those options to the CWGT at the November 2026 CWGT meeting. The WTWG will continue to discuss and compile these options at the October and November WTWG meetings. Members with any specific thoughts or feedback can feel free to reach out to Caroline Kleis (Kleis.Caroline@epa.gov) and Auston Smith (Smith.Auston@epa.gov) at any point during this process.

Meeting Minutes

I. Introductions & Announcements

Lead: Sushanth Gupta, MWCOG & Auston Smith, EPA

Sushanth and Auston walked the group through the following announcements:

- Approval of the August WTWG Meeting Minutes- Sushanth Gupta, MWCOG
 - The WTWG approved the August 2026 Meeting Minutes.
- Decommissioning of CBP NEIEN Node- Megan Thyng, EPA
 - Megan Thyng, EPA confirmed that the CBP NEIEN node has been decommissioned as of August 31st and all progress BMP submissions should be made via CAST. Megan noted that while the submission portal is in a different location, nothing else has changed. The progress reporting portal on CAST allows users to upload individual XMLs as well as a zip file containing multiple XMLs.
 - Anyone with lingering issues using the next CAST XML submission should reach out to Megan Thyng.
 - An FAQ presentation on the NEIEN Node Decommissioning is available here: <https://www.chesapeakebay.net/files/documents/Decommissioning-of-NEIEN-Node-Announcements-and-FAQs.pdf>
- EPA 2025 Assessment and Milestone Evaluation and Chesapeake Bay Program Partnership 2025 Progress Release Reminder- Suzanne Trevena, EPA
 - Suzanne Trevena, EPA, informed the group that Milestone Evaluations and the 2025 Assessment have been transmitted to partners (jurisdictions, Conowingo WIP Steering Committee, Federal Office Directors). However, due to a change in procedures, things to be posted to the EPA website need to go through headquarters review before it is posted. As such, these documents will be posted as soon as they have been approved.
 - Post Meeting Note: The EPA 2025 Assessment and EPA Evaluations of 2024-2025 Milestone Progress and 2026-2027 Milestone Commitments were posted on September 14th. You can access them [here](#).
- 2026 Progress Schedule- Auston Smith, EPA
 - Auston confirmed the receipt of the majority of the QAPPs and noted that feedback will be distributed by early December. Auston also noted land use submissions that are ongoing and requested that he be copied on any of those submissions. Federal record submissions to jurisdictions is also ongoing, and the window for BMP submissions has also recently opened.
 - Auston will follow up via email with a poll to jurisdictions for early December meetings to talk through verification and data submissions.
- Phase 7 Model of Record Timing- Auston Smith, EPA
 - Auston followed up from last month, confirming the understanding he shared at the August meeting. Auston clarified that from now until the year 2030, Phase 6 will remain the model of record as the Phase 7 Model is reviewed, planning targets are created, and WIPs are created to reach those planning targets. That

will be in the middle of the 2029 Progress year. This is a future partnership decision on whether we want to tee up the swath of models in advance of 2029 Progress release or if we would hold off and utilize the Phase 7 Model for 2030 Progress when it is released in 2031.

- TMDL Tracking and Reporting Contact Update on CAST- Auston Smith, EPA
 - Auston noted that he has reached out to several reporting agencies to identify the most up to date reporting contacts for CAST. This reporting and general contact [list](#) will be updated on CAST. The WTWG is encouraged to reach out with any edits to the list.

Decisions:

1. The WTWG approved the August 2026 Meeting Minutes.

Actions:

1. The CBP NEIEN Node has been decommissioned as of August 31, 2026. For more information, the WTWG is encouraged to view the [FAQ presentation](#) and reach out to Megan Thyng (Thyng.Megan@epa.gov), Raj Bojja (rbojja@chesapeakebay.net), and Jess Rigelman (jrigelman@j7llc.com) with any questions.
2. Suzanne Trevena, EPA, informed the WTWG that there was a delay in the posting of the EPA Milestones evaluations, pending remaining approval. Please reach out to Suzanne (trevena.suzanne@epa.gov) with any remaining questions.
 - a. Post Meeting Note: The EPA 2025 Assessment and EPA Evaluations of 2024-2025 Milestone Progress and 2026-2027 Milestone Commitments were posted on September 14th. You can access them [here](#).
3. Auston Smith, EPA, will reach out to jurisdictions with a poll to schedule verification calls between December 14-18th.
 - a. Post Meeting Note: Auston contacted jurisdictions/reporting contacts on 9/17. Please fill out the WhenisGood poll by 9/25 and a meeting will be scheduled accordingly.
4. The [TMDL Tracking and Reporting Contact list](#) has been updated and will be posted to CAST. Please look over this list and provide any edits to Auston Smith (Smith.Auston@epa.gov).

Discussion Notes:

Caroline Kleis (in chat): An FAQ presentation on the NEIEN Node Decommissioning is available here: <https://www.chesapeakebay.net/files/documents/Decommissioning-of-NEIEN-Node-Announcements-and-FAQs.pdf>

Bill Keeling (in chat): Is there a test instance?

Bill Keeling (in chat): Does the test have a different url?

Raj Bojja (in chat): Yes, <https://cast-test.chesapeakebay.net/>

Megan Thyng: I see the question. Yes, there is a test as well.

II. Voting Membership Structure & Workgroup Processes

Lead: Auston Smith, EPA; WTWG Nominees

Auston Smith, EPA, reminded the group of the results from the email vote to solidify the path forward for filling the WTWG voting membership. Auston also introduced nominees put forward in response to the subsequent call for nominations (Kevin DuBois, DoW and Karl Wilson, USDA). Time was made for Karl to introduce himself, and next steps were noted to the group.

Actions:

1. The call for nominations for WTWG at-large member positions will be extended ahead of the October meeting. Those interested in nominating themselves or others for the open positions should reach out to Caroline Kleis (Kleis.Caroline@epa.gov) and Auston Smith (Smith.Auston@epa.gov).
 - a. Post Meeting Note: The call for nominations was extended to 9/17. No additional nominations were received by this date. As such, the WTWG will vote on the approval of the nominations received (Kevin Du Bois, DoW, and Karl Wilson, USDA) at the October WTWG meeting.

III. Update on Expert Panel Protocol Revisions

Lead: Auston Smith, EPA

Auston Smith, EPA, provided the group with an update on the process to revise the Expert Panel Protocol. Initial considerations and adjustments were shared with the group, and time was made for members to provide their feedback. Auston also overviewed next steps and future opportunities for WTWG members to provide feedback.

Actions:

1. A draft of the revised Expert Panel Protocol will be sent to the WTWG for review, ahead of the October WTWG meeting. WTWG members are asked to review this draft and provide feedback in advance of October 1st for discussion at the October meeting.
 - a. Post Meeting Note: This draft was distributed by Auston Smith (Smith.Auston@epa.gov) on 9/17. You can access the draft [here](#). A summary of comments received will be shared with the WTWG at the October meeting.

Discussion Notes:

Norm Goulet: Nine months....no. Having run many of these things, that is nearly impossible. It takes time to identify the experts. It takes time to get them together to meet. These people are, for the most part, at least from what we've done in the past, outside of Bay folks. They even may be outside of the region folks. We are asking a lot of them just to participate on these panels to begin with and then to trying to get schedules to match up is very difficult. It is very difficult to ask someone for a full day, so these meetings typically are not full day meetings. There is usually a lot of ground to cover, especially for a new BMP. These things unfortunately have dragged out to be upwards of two years to get through the entire process. I am assuming the nine months is to bring it from the initial inception to the development of the report. If you are specifically talking about nine months from the inception of the idea to getting it through the various approval processes, the answer is there is no way.

Auston Smith: Generally, we were thinking the panel report would be working its way through the approval process. So, I think that this effort is going to fall into the "no way" category based on that summary. I appreciate that Norm. Heard loud and clear. I have not run an Expert Panel process. I have supported several of the ones that have gone through since I have been here in the Watershed Technical capacity, but not as a formal member of the group. So, I appreciate your expertise on that. Definitely looking forward to more of your comments here. That's exactly what we do want to hear. Nine months is not ironclad. It's an attempt to make it a reasonable timeline, where it could fit in to a Progress year afterwards. This product is going to be very much tied into the model update frequency agenda item that we're about to get to. It's been a major effort that the partnership has wanted to pick up regarding when new BMPs or new understandings of BMP costs, associated verification programs to support those, can be integrated into the model formally. It wouldn't say listed as a practice BMP, but it would be in the model for reporting that very next year. So, an effort that we're trying to allude to in this protocol is saying, does the BMP

have an existing history or is it completely new? A lot of new innovative practices are coming around that can support water quality. So, if there is no past history of this practice being in place, it would be completely new, it's a lot easier to integrate that than it is to adjust the BMP's history that's been in the model for a long time and has been calibrated upon. So, maybe finding a sweet spot where completely new BMPs approved through this protocol could be integrated is certainly a part of it too. We'll be looking forward to all of those questions and concerns as we get through it.

Norm Goulet: You shot yourself in the foot because I was going to volunteer you to head up the next Expert Panel process in the Urban Stormwater Workgroup!

Mark Dubin (in chat): Another factor to consider for expert panels is the continuing need to rely on volunteer experts that the CBPO is not compensating for their time and efforts.

Katie Brownson (in chat): What is the process for revising the protocol? Who is leading this effort?

Auston Smith: I see Katie's question. This group is leading the effort. I might call on Jeremy Hanson to correct me, but I believe it has been created and revised twice. This attempt will be the third since 2014.

Jeremy Hanson: Two or three times, it depends on when you start the clock. There have definitely been three major re-writes since I have been around. This might actually be the fourth, but we haven't used the latest revision all that much.

Dylan Burgevin (in chat): Maybe you will get into this, but what would happen if a finished report could not be generated by the 6 to 9 month deadline?

Auston Smith: Dylan, that's a great question. We are not going to be doling out punishments, but we will certainly try and codify how efforts extending past whatever timeline the Watershed Technical Workgroup agrees is feasible, should be addressed. Maybe an Action Team is what needs to be stood up for this. We are really trying to prevent the Workgroup from having to go outside of its membership on some of these items. We are hoping that the source sector workgroup or whomever may be bringing forward these ideas will have expertise in house, and we know that sometimes that will not be possible. For those circumstances, is contractual support the best way forward? Open to thoughts there. We've kind of put some of that in writing as well. If you have any immediate thoughts on that, Dylan, we would love to hear them. But as people get a chance to review this, if you want to provide comments, I can integrate those and respond to those as they're received. There's not necessarily a timeline on the review of this document. It'd be good for it to be done by 2027, but we don't have a formal deadline here.

Norm Goulet (in chat): Katie's question reminded me that I nominated her for one of the Federal positions

Dylan Burgevin: I would hate to see 6 to 9 months of hard work then just kind of be put on the shelf and go to waste, right? So I don't know if it's just that we wouldn't get it in that Progress year, but it might be picked up again the following year or further down the line. I'd just hate to see all that hard work go to waste.

Auston Smith: Absolutely, that would be the worst case scenario. You're right. Acknowledging Mark's comment, as volunteers that are not necessarily voting members in the work groups that are very familiar with the partnership, if they want to volunteer their time, we are always happy to have it. So great flag. Thank you, Mark. Any other immediate thoughts or knee-jerk reactions to this? I am trying to send this out in a couple of weeks. We can touch on it again in October. I'll be able to produce a summary of major comments that I have heard a lot.

IV. Model Update Frequency

Lead: Auston Smith, EPA

Auston Smith, EPA, informed the group of next steps for this Clean Water Goal Team request. Time was made for initial discussions on model update frequency.

Actions:

1. The CWGT directed the WTWG to develop options for when to update CAST and to present those options to the CWGT at the November 2026 CWGT meeting. The WTWG will continue to discuss and compile these options at the October and November WTWG meetings. Members with any specific thoughts or feedback can feel free to reach out to Caroline Kleis (Kleis.Caroline@epa.gov) and Auston Smith (Smith.Auston@epa.gov) at any point during this process.

Discussion Notes:

Bill Keeling (in chat): Every 2 years is counter productive. The numbers change too much and erodes confidence in the modeling. Besides the workload reviewing it. Remember CAST 21.

Auston Smith: I vaguely remember CAST 21. I know a lot of you were around for more of that than I was. Thanks, Bill.

Norm Goulet: This is certainly not the first time this conversation has come up. The two years was a compromise by and within the states. There were people who wanted new BMPs as they came in to be reflected immediately. Then we have people, along the lines of what Bill was just saying, who thought two years was too short. They wanted a more stable platform and to be able to rely on stability. So, there was a counter position to stretch them out even longer. So, two years became a bit of a compromise for everybody in terms of that. Putting a new BMP in was not a problem if it didn't have a history. If it had a history, it was very problematic, because anything that alters the calibration was a no-go. Gary was working towards a process of trying to eliminate that bottleneck. I don't know where that ever ended up. Now that Phase 7 has changed platforms dramatically using CAST and CalCAST, I have no idea even more as to where that ends up. That's a major consideration. Some of the jurisdictions wanted immediate BMPs put in there to take advantage of trying to move towards their goals. So, the two years was a compromise. That doesn't mean we have to change things. The other aspect is that we are no longer tied to the input deck for CAST. This is going to be a combination of trying to find that median happy spot for everyone. That's what it is really going to boil down to. Where is everyone's comfort level as to when they can get access to a new BMP for crediting their Progress runs versus how much effort it is going to take to get a new BMP in? The other aspect to it is every time we put in new BMPs, we are changing the Model again, and it seems like we are already in a cycle of changing the model too frequently. It got a little better with CAST, but I don't think everyone is going to want new versions of CAST every year. Like Bill was saying, maybe even two years is insufficient. So, that's the long and short of the conversation as to where we got the two years from.

Arianna Johns (in chat): Will the federal partners have the people power to build the input data sets for every 2 years? NAIP was a huge issue and that was before the newer fed funding constraints.

Auston Smith: It sounds like a lift to me. Great question there, Arianna. Good flag also that NAIP was a huge issue.

Dave Montali (in chat): Plan on once. Incorporate new land use and ag census. Say 2035

Dave Montali: I accept that two years was counterproductive. Updating the model every time someone wants a change doesn't work. I don't think it's unrealistic to create a model and use it for five years. I am not seeing a big issue with BMPs. We haven't done a BMP Expert Panel for years. If there is something out there that we aren't counting that really moves the needles for state WIPs, I don't know what that is. That is just my personal opinion. But, I am curious about the fertilizer data bullet on that slide. I thought we were updating fertilizer data in Progress

Scenarios whenever it was available to us, and they really didn't need a model reissuance to use the latest years of fertilizer data.

Auston Smith: You are right. I think this was a general bullet to welcome data sets on the horizon that could be of interest to discuss including. We are just trying to field possible updates, not saying one is coming.

Dave Montali: I just didn't understand it because, in my head, we did things in CAST 23 and now we are collecting that data from the states to make it less latent. Still, I thought that if we've got data now through '23, when '24 becomes available, we build that into the Progress Scenario. But, I may be completely wrong.

Auston Smith: I don't think you are. The AMT has already kind of gone through fertilizer data review in some circumstances. Would anything still be of use to review in the coming years that could be incorporated? Not a suggestion, just a question. Thanks for allowing me to provide clarity on that bullet.

Norm Goulet (in chat): Agree Dave. Years ago, they were fast and frequent; now they are much more infrequent and may not be the driver to update that they once were.

Auston Smith: Dave, Norm, if it is only once in 2035, we are incorporating the new land use and Ag Census, and those are the two updates. Those would be the two major updates, and that could be one suggestion we put forward? I just wanted clarity on the 2035 suggestion.

Norm Goulet: Trying to align the years is going to be a bit of an issue. They are not always reported when they are supposed to be, so planning on the Ag Census coinciding with the high res land use might be a little problematic.

Auston Smith: Good flag. For the high res land use, it's possibly 2034. If it is late at all, then 2035 really seems like a stretch. So, maybe it is making the one update in 2036 or 2037. It is not as nice of a round number, but maybe that is what the partnership would need.

Dave Montali: I just threw out 2035 because it is half way between 2030 and 2040. If you can have the optimum year, even knowing that we're going to do it in '37, we will still be using that model in '42, because even if we had a Phase 8 coming, we [wouldn't use it until later]. All I am trying to say is with the big things, do it once. Two years is too frequent. It causes too much counter productivity. I am not saying absolutely 2035, but just try to do it once in the planned period or implementation of Phase 7.

Auston Smith: That's certainly one option we could put forth. I haven't heard it on this call, but we could make no updates until 2040. You just wrap up everything then, and then it would be more of an updated version but without the headache in the middle. Not saying that's what I would prefer, but I've heard that offline as well. I've certainly heard some folks that really do like the two year steps. So, there are a lot of options out there. Are there any other immediate thoughts on other options that we can start to provide more in depth summaries on for the October meeting?

Jeremy Hanson (in chat): Noting that partnership wide we have 3 year cycle for workplans (2027-2030, 2030-2033, etc) and 6 year cycle for management strategies moving forward. Just so we can try to align or stagger the big modeling asks with the demands of that partnership wide adaptive management cycle.

Auston Smith: Noting the comment in the chat from Jeremy. Great flag. How does that work and resulting steps need to be tied into whatever year or years of updates that we want to choose?

Scott Heidel: I realize we have all these different cycles that are going on concurrently. I think one thing that needs to be consistent is the model itself. If goal posts keeps moving, how are you supposed to plan for that? So, every time the model gets updated, we get new targets. With new targets, you have to reset all your workplans, management strategies, and things like that. Not saying we can't do that, but what I am saying is it is going to just compound the issue and make more and more work.

Auston Smith: Great flag. We will want to make sure that those considerations are somewhat ironed out in the options we want to put forward.

Arianna Johns (in chat): Could we make the update dataset contingent rather than time contingent? When the datasets are complete and vetted then we go to building the update?

Auston Smith: Arianna, I want to make sure I am getting your question right. I think it is a good consideration if I am getting that right. I would see that as being similar to Dave and Norm's thoughts but rather than saying 2035, as we've talked about, it would be saying as soon as the Ag Census, Land Use, and XYZ data sets, are ready, that's when the update happens. That would be your way of putting it?

Arianna Johns: Yep, that's it.

Auston Smith: Phrasing it that way would be a good approach for one if not all of the ideas we want to put forward. CWGT leadership might want to tie a date to that expectation, but I agree that putting the proposals up front underlined by when the data sets are available will be a key distinction, so I like that option.

Dylan Burgevin: Just for clarification, are we saying that if we were to do one large scale update in 2035 or whenever the data sets become available, all new BMPs would be updated at that time too? Or would it just be that anything that has had an Expert Panel or that has some sort of update within the last five years would be submitted all at the same time? That's question A. Question B- does the six to nine month restriction matter quite as much if we aren't doing updates every two years? Can that timeline be shifted out a little bit just to say as soon as possible?

Auston Smith: Question B, that's a good consideration. I think that we are more quickly being asked to determine model frequency updates. If we determine the 2035-ish date is the best option, then that consideration should be tied into our justification for the Expert Panel process timeline too. Nine months makes a little less sense, so maybe it is a year or a year and a half. So, great consideration. Can you remind me of question A?

Dylan Burgevin: If we have the 2035 or 5 year benchmark coming through, would it just be a lump sum of all BMPs?

Auston Smith: I think that, unless it is a Phase update, BMPs with a history already in the Model would have to wait until 2040 for a Phase change, unless we are really doing a new calibration in the middle of this time period. Would we already have to be doing that in 2035 under the hypothetical scenario we've been talking about, Jeremy?

Jeremy Hanson: I think that is ultimately a Jess question to answer with certainty. The way I think of adding new BMPs in is that we can always add them as a planning BMP. So, they will be available in CAST to do "what if" scenarios. Those can be added in pretty quickly once they are approved as a planning BMP. What the CAST update would allow us to do is to change those from planning to official. Whether there is going to be cases where a specific BMP might cause other problems or prevent us from changing it from planning to official, that'd be something I'd have to hear from Jess about. If it doesn't have a history and it's a simple efficiency, I can't imagine it would necessarily have to wait for a Phase change. I think there are ways to shift it from planning to official in most cases. That's just my understanding.

Auston Smith: Much appreciated. Thanks, Dylan. Great questions. We'll be trying to get insight as we can get it before the October meeting to help us dive into these discussions.

Christina Lyerly: I think I just need a little bit of clarity to see if I am understanding correctly. Auston, you said 2040 and waiting until then for new BMPs with a new Phase change, versus just a CAST update which I thought was when we could introduce new BMPs. They are two different things. Am I understanding that incorrectly?

Auston Smith: I think that 2035 is when new BMPs could be put in, depending on the ease of it. I was thinking that a more complicated BMP that would require the Model to be recalibrated was a Phase update, and not the version changes like a CAST 17 to 19 to 23. Others in the Modeling Workgroup or Ad Hoc, is there any confirmation you might be able to provide there?

Jeremy Hanson: I will just say that this is something we work out on a case-by-case basis as a part of the Technical Appendix for each practice. So, if the panel has gone down a path that would make something more complicated to add to the Model than any of us realized, we definitely

figure that out as a part of the Technical Appendix process. I think that's been incredibly limited when a new BMP has proved to be that complex, so I think we're maybe talking about a one in 50 type scenario. So, I don't want us to laser focus on that. Probably every practice we'd be seeing coming down the pike, it would be the simple scenario where we add it as a BMP until we have a CAST update. Then it can become official to be used in Progress. I think we don't want to overfocus on the rare scenarios that we would identify on a case-by-case basis.

Auston Smith: Thanks, Jeremy. I appreciate that clarity. Christina, does that get to your question well enough right now? Ideally, 2035 would be the first update for it.

Christina Lyerly: Yeah, that's helpful. Thanks.

Auston Smith: Absolutely. Thanks a lot, Jeremy, for that insight. I think we've got additional slides to walk through.

Auston walked the group through the latest [draft version of the CAST data update frequency spreadsheet](#), which will be updated and posted to CAST.

V. Wrap-Up

Lead: Caroline Kleis, CRC

VI. Adjourn

Next Meeting: October 1st, 2026 from 10:00AM-12:00PM

Attendees:

Sushanth Gupta, MWCOG
Christina Lyerly, MDE
Auston Smith, EPA
Caroline Kleis, CRC
Bill Keeling, VA DEQ
Joseph Schell, DNREC
Sabine Miller, DOEE
Mark Dubin, Virginia Cooperative Extension
Dylan Burgevin, MDE
Karl Wilson, USDA
Matt Kofroth, LCCD
Tom Butler, EPA
Scott Heidel, PA DEP
Kevin McLean, VA DEQ
Raj Bojja, CBPO
Megan Thyng, EPA
Arianna Johns, VA DEQ
Suzanne Trevena, EPA
Cass Klingaman, NYSDEC
Josh Glace, Larson Design Group
Kelly Gable, EPA
Norm Goulet, NVRC
Andrew Leight, MDA
Tyler Trostle, PA DEP
Samantha Cotton, DNREC
Eugenia Hart, Tetra Tech
Cassie Davis, NYSDEC
Dave Montali, Tetra Tech

Rachel Owrutsky, DNREC
Pat Thompson, Energy Works
Kaylyn Gootman, EPA
Katie Brownson, USFS
Bruce Naylor, PA DEP
Ashley Hullinger, PA DEP
Elizabeth Hoffman, MDA
Tammy Heath, Mattaponi Tribe and Reservation
Caitlin Lange, Mattaponi Tribe and Reservation
Jeremy Hanson, CRC
Eric Hughes, EPA
Bo Williams, EPA