

---

**CAC Members Present:** Paul Bruder, John Dawes, Andrew Der, Matt Ehrhart, Christy Everett, Dale Gardner, Verna Harrison, Jeff Holland, Paula Jasinski, Pat Levin (Thurs.), Bill Martin, Karen McJunkin, Jennifer Reed-Harry, Charlie Stek, Nikki Tinsley, Victor Ukpolo, Bob Wayland, Neil Wilkie and staff- Jessica Blackburn and Amy Robins

**Guests:** Carin Bisland (CBPO), Brent Bolin (MD League of Conservation Voters), Frank Dawson (MD DNR), Jim Edward (CBPO), Matt Ellis (STAC), LJ Ingram (Chart, LLC), Susan Julius (STAC), Chance Lundy, Rhonda Manning (PA DEP), John McCoy (Columbia Association), Beth McGee (CBF), Rob Moxy, Brian Noyes (Colonial SWCD), Ramone Palenzia-Calvo (MD League of Conservation Voters, Green Latinos), Lucinda Powers (CBPO), Jake Reilly (NFWF), Al Todd (Alliance), Sacoby Wilson (University of Maryland), Julie Winters (EPA), and Jill Witkowski (Choose Clean Water).

**Meeting presentations and materials are located:**  
<http://www.chesapeakebay.net/S=0/calendar/event/21406/>

#### **Thursday, November 20, 2014**

CAC Chair John Dawes called the meeting to order at 11:00am providing a brief overview of the meeting's objectives. CAC members and guests introduced themselves.

#### **Behavioral Economics: STAC Report**

*Susan Julius, EPA and Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee Member*

Susan provided an overview of the August 27-28, 2014 Behavioral Economics and the Bay Workshop and goals of the workshop. The workshop participants defined Behavioral Economics (BE) as "the intersection of economics and psychology." The workshop goals were to broaden knowledge of behavioral economics and potential for applications in the Bay; explore application to specific problem areas (non-point source agricultural pollution and household/homeowner land and water management); increase the knowledge exchange and expand collaboration among practitioners and researchers to address Bay-specific policy challenges; identify and prioritize follow-up strategies for extending insights from the workshop; and communicate the knowledge to state and EPA policymakers and other key audiences. Susan reviewed David Just's Health Lunches (2014) study where research focused on discovering how choices/decisions can be influenced by relatively subtle changes in framing or phrasing.

Research recommendations from the workshop include identify motivation for behaviors that can inform on Bay outreach and engagement programs; efficacy of programs geared toward informing homeowners about actions and links to the Bay; methods to account for BMP implementation by homeowners; methods to embed stewardship and water quality improvement into farmers' social identity; methods to cultivate peer pressure related to stewardship to encourage change; effective visual demonstrations/technique that encourage behavioral change among various communities; information that would motivate farmers to increase their participation in conservation programs; and collaborative learning communities that identify opportunities and refine implementation approaches related to behavior change.

CAC members questioned the lack of a current mechanisms and limited studies in the environmental field. Members were asked to spread the STAC Behavior Economics Report to encourage Management Board and Principle Staff Committee to focus funding in areas of behavior change and fund the marketing for delivering the science. A

discussion regarding better marketing techniques occurred with partnering organizations or conducting Leadership Programs as possible solutions.

### **Working Lunch – CAC Priority – Stewardship: Local Watershed Organization**

*John McCoy, Columbia Association Watershed Manager*

John provided a brief history of Columbia, Maryland. The original developer James Rouse envisioned the development of the city to be guided four basic goals: build a complete city; respect the land; provide for the growth of people; and make a profit. The focus of respecting the land led to open spaces being integrated into the community rather than having a greenbelt around the developed areas. Columbia has three man-made lakes, an extensive path system, playgrounds and parks, and dedicated natural areas allowing habitats for birds, waterfowl and other animals.

In 2009, Columbia completed their Watershed Management plan. The Management Plan relies equally on two approaches: restoration projects (retrofits) and community actions. The Columbia Association has built eleven bio-retention facilities with the capacity to treat four acres of impervious surface or ~190,000 gallons of runoff during any given storm; one wetland bench in a stormwater pond; two stream stabilization projects; four stormwater outfall and stream stabilization project; planted about eight acres of trees; and treated over 13 acres of impervious surface. Through a grant from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources the Columbia Association has a homeowner Cost Share Program that will pay for 75% of the installation of a rain garden for homeowners. They have a landscape firm on contract for the installations and homeowners can choose from five different designs with the average cost to homeowner being around \$740. The Columbia Association has provided outreach materials to educate homeowners about fertilizing lawns and provides free soil testing kits. Grant reimbursements are also available for conservation landscaping, tree planting, permeable pavers, pavement removal, green roofs, cisterns and dry wells.

### **The Economic Benefits of Cleaning Up the Bay**

*Beth McGee, Chesapeake Bay Foundation*

Beth reviewed the definition of Ecosystem Services highlighting the “natural benefits” that we tend to not pay for until those benefits are lost. The CBF report is limited by selecting only eight ecosystem services: aesthetic value; air pollution treatment; climate stability; food production; recreation; waste treatment; water supply and water regulation. Beth reviewed three scenarios: the present-day dollar value of natural benefits for the watershed (based on 2009 pre-Blueprint [TMDL]); the dollar value of the same services post-Blueprint; and the estimate of what we lose if we don’t fully implement the Blueprint (“Business as Usual”). CBF worked with Chesapeake Bay Program staff to acquire fine scale land use information for the entire watershed for the different scenarios.

The Implementation of the Blueprint will have two primary effects: (1) changes in acres of the various habitats and (2) improved condition of existing habitats and their ecological services. Present day benefits \$107 billion annually spread across the entire watershed. The “Business as Usual” model without the benefits of implementing the Blueprint show a decline to \$101.5 billion annually. After the Blueprint is implemented if you look at just the benefits (no costs), the CBF study suggests the added value of the Blueprint outweighs the cost 4:1 with a \$22 billion in annual benefits from the baseline.

### **CAC Priority – Stewardship, Diversity and Environmental Justice**

*Jill Witkowski, Executive Director, Choose Clean Water Coalition, National Environmental Justice Advisory Council*

Jill opened the panel with a brief explanation of her experiences as an environmental lawyer and executive director. She provided the structure of the panel and introductions.

*Sacoby Wilson, Professor, University of Maryland, Environmental Health Disparities*

Sacoby talked about how the Social Movement and Environmental Movement merged to form the Environment Justice Movement. Early actions focused on placement of chemical dumping, landfills, roadway, and chicken/hog farms in lower income areas which can cause major health issues. African American communities are often overburdened with hazards, pathogens, high density of fast food restaurants, and lack green spaces. Environmental pollution along with high levels of psychosocial stressors like racism, crime, and discrimination put an overburden on communities of color and further increase health disparities. He pointed to the need of education in lower income areas for residents to become citizen scientists so they are empowered to help change their communities. He spoke about the upcoming December 3, 2014 Environmental Health Symposium that will address nutrient runoff, fracking, stormwater, health disparities, chicken farms, nutrient trading, and a panel on the Chesapeake Bay Agreement.

*Ramone Palenzia-Calvo, MD League of Conservation Voters and Green Latinos*

Ramone talked about his role with the League of Conservation Voters as increasing awareness among Latino communities of water health degradation, finding new leaders, and promoting partnerships with non-environmental groups. Currently, African Americans are more engaged than Latinos. Ramone's research finds that the environment is of less concern for Latinos. Issues of concern in the Latino communities are more focused on immigration, language barriers, education gaps, income disparities, and health concerns. Education about pollution is essential since in some cases the air and water may be cleaner in their community than their country of origin. Topics of discussion to engage the Latino Community on the environment are: asthma, trash, low access to healthy food options, health care, sustenance fishing, and proper chemical pest control. Engagement is most effective when connections are made to family health.

*Brent Bolin, MD League of Conservation Voters*

Brent applauded Sacoby's work in making connections with psychosocial stressors. There have been increased calls from lower income families about nearby CAFOs and concerns with children's health. He stressed the need to build relationships with communities based on their interests, and then together you can make the connection to the environment. A lot of the problems communities face are systemic and the solutions should be as well. Sometimes lack of knowledge is not the problem, but more education is key to solutions. For example, 17,000 people eat fish out of the Anacostia even though people know the fish is contaminated. An approach would be to link problems of obesity and how toxins are stored in fat with sustenance fishing.

Some of the solutions to addressing disparities and environmental injustices include: Reaching people you don't normally reach; realizing that budget expenditures are reflection of priorities- what communities are receiving money for clean-up and restoration projects?; grant programs should require and allow time for building community relationships; solutions to environmental problems must relate to home life; watch for environmental injustice hot spots in nutrient trading; teach communities to test for water quality in their local streams and rivers; require jurisdictions to spend more money in EJ hot spots; all federal agencies should have a plan for EJ that benefit communities left behind.

### **Small Watershed Grant and Innovative Nutrient and Sediment Reduction Grant Programs**

*Jake Reilly, Director, Chesapeake Bay Program, National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF)*

Jake reviewed NFWF's Chesapeake Bay business plan strategies including a focus on high priority targeted watersheds, support for innovation on cross cutting issues, and advancement of Local Government Green Infrastructure Solutions. The Small Watershed Grants (SWG) ranges from \$20K-\$200K requiring a 25% match with the aim to improve local waters that contribute to the Bay's health. About \$3 million are awarded per year with 25-30% of the proposals being funded. State agencies are not eligible for the SWG programs. The Innovative Nutrient and Sediment Reduction Grants (INSR) Grant ranges from \$200K-\$500K and funds innovative approaches to reduce Nitrogen, Phosphorus, and Sediment requiring a 1:1 match with grants. About \$6-8 million per year is award to 15-20% of the proposals received. State agencies are eligible for the INSR grant program.

CAC members talked about concerns that small groups may not be capable of applying to NFWF. Jake explained how the proposed revamped Technical Capacity program will allow for more partnering between large and small groups to achieve water quality goals. Jake proposed several possible opportunities for the CAC to weigh in on the review process of grant applications. CAC agreed to continue to engage with NFWF on the Chesapeake Bay Grants Programs. Currently, there is no assessment of whether NFWF grants are reaching EJ hot spot communities.

### **Friday, November 21, 2014**

The meeting was called to order by Chair, John Dawes at 8:10am.

### **Chesapeake Bay Program Updates**

*Jim Edward, Deputy Director, EPA Chesapeake Bay Program*

Jim spoke to the design of the new Watershed Agreement stating that it aims to provide a balance between commitment to a particular goal or action and the flexibility required for adaptive management. Management Strategies will be drafted and revised over the next 6-8 months. Each management strategy will address the same elements, using a framework approved by the PSC.

The process to identify key factors and rank them by importance will be done with whatever amount of science and info is available at the time and later revised through adaptive management as more is learned. The Goal Implementation Teams (GITs) will continue to identify current efforts and gaps, monitoring and assessing progress. Currently, the GITs have created five new workgroups and will be reaching out to groups that have not been engaged in the past to move forward. Interested stakeholders can track different management strategies on the CBP website. Two handouts were provided to the CAC: a management strategy timeline and the GIT budgets.

*Lucinda Power, Watershed Implementation Plan Specialist, EPA Chesapeake Bay Program*

Lucinda defined the midpoint assessment as the review of progress towards meeting 60% interim target by the 2017 and the 2025 Chesapeake Bay TMDL goal. During this assessment, the EPA reviews the Bay jurisdictions' WIPs to ensure they are on track for the development of the Phase III WIPs. All the data will be gathered, reviewed, and incorporating new data and science into the Partnership's decision support tools. Lucinda provided the guiding principles for the Midpoint Assessment as well as the bottom line for meeting the 2025 goal. She referenced the October 2012 Water Quality GIT meeting and December 2012 PSC decisions that identified and approved certain priorities for these midpoint assessments. A timeline for the midpoint assessment was reviewed and a link for reviewing was provided within her presentation. This past October 2014 meeting for Water Quality GIT showed a clear understanding of where we need to be by 2017 and what steps need to be taken, and by whom. The GIT was able to achieve consensus on the midpoint assessment schedule and decision-making process.

### **Bay Agreement Stewardship Outcomes: Management Strategies**

*Al Todd, Executive Director, Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay*

*Stewardship Goal Implementation Team Member*

Al reviewed the Citizen Stewardship Goal and highlighted the importance of this goal being *the people part* of the new Bay Agreement. He pointed that the new Bay Agreement recognizes that long term success depends on the support and action that arises from local citizens and local conservation groups; local government leaders must have the capacity and tools to address watershed issues and the support to implement policies and incentive that support restoration efforts; and the base of the environmental movement and its leadership must be more diverse and inclusive. Improvement will happen by increasing the number and diversity of trained and mobilized citizen volunteers with the knowledge and skills needed to enhance the health of their local watersheds. The Citizen Stewardship Framework identifies individual citizen action and behaviors, volunteerism/Collective Community Action, and Citizen Leaders/Champions to mobilize/increase the base. Al pointed to the importance of having a metrics to measure general awareness and effective of programs/approaches while making sure the metrics add value.

*Carin Bisland, EPA Chesapeake Bay Program*

*Partnering and Leadership Goal Implementation Team Coordinator*

Carin reviewed the Stewardship Goal and Local Leadership Outcome. The two near term approaches highlighted are an assessment of Local Leadership Development Programs and workshops to get input from local leaders. A Maryland Chesapeake Bay Trust grant of \$20,000 will help with the assessment of the Local Leadership Development Programs. The intended outcome of the workshop is to gain insight into how participants became leaders; identify unique leadership characteristics of current leaders in local conservation actions; identify elements of and barriers to effective leadership training and education programs; gather input for the development of a management strategy for local leadership; and solicit volunteers to serve as advisors. The Local Leadership Workgroup is scheduled for December 3, 2014 at the Patuxent Wildlife Center with invitees including local elected officials, local appointed officials, key local staff, educators for building local knowledge and capacity, and signatory representatives interested in the development of this management strategy. This Workgroup's timeline expects a draft management strategy with input by December 15, 2014 with assessments and gap filling to occur until March 2015 at which point it will go out for public input and be finalized in June 2015.

*Frank Dawson, Deputy Secretary, Maryland Department of Natural Resources*

*Diversity Workgroup Chair*

Frank reviewed the Diversity Workgroup's goal to "identify minority stakeholder groups that are not currently represented in the leadership, decision-making and implementation of conservation and restoration activities and create meaningful opportunities and programs to recruit and engage them in the Partnership's efforts". He reviewed the importance of this goal for long term success. This workgroup also provided their definition of diversity "to expand the diversity of the workforce and participants in restoration and conservation activities means to include a wide range of people of all races, income levels, faiths, gender, age, and sexual orientation, disabilities along with diverse groups. For this effort to be successful it will require us to honor the culture, history, and social concerns of local population and communities." He reported the following jurisdictions as participating: DE, D.C. MD, PA, VA, CBC, and EPA representing the Federal Government. He provided a review of current actions taken. The Diversity Outcome Kickoff meeting took place on October 24, 2014. They are developing an inventory of ongoing activities which focus on diversity in the watershed. A total of four workgroups were created for the development, implementation and tracking of the Management Strategy: Enhancing Communications and Outreach, Employment and Professional Engagement, and Promote Environmental Justice.

The Diversity Action Team will be collaborating with other GITs to expand diversity throughout the following management strategies: public access, stewardship, toxics, environmental literacy, local leadership, tree canopy, land conservation, and climate resiliency. The next steps include submitting a draft plan outline with sections completed on baseline and local outreach plans on December 15, 2014. In 2015, sections will continue to be drafted on a schedule.

The CAC Coordinator, Jessica Blackburn, reminded the members that they could help enhance the collection of information for these strategies by forwarding information to personal and business contacts.

### **CAC Business Meeting**

CAC members discussed a memo presented by Verna recommending CAC send two letters regarding issues of Chesapeake Bay Program governance: one on the super majority voting process and the other on voting participation of the advisory committees. The first letter recommends if a workgroup or GIT cannot reach consensus, then they must raise the issue to the PSC before they invoke a super-majority vote. The second letter recommended that voting participation on the Management Board be broadened to include the Advisory Committees. Dale Gardner voiced caution at this recommendation. CAC agreed to send the letters.

Members discussed tasks listed in the CAC RFP issued by EPA for competitive award. The Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay will submit a proposal for the continued support of the committee.

Charlie Stek motioned to approve the August 2014 meeting minutes. Matt Ehrhart seconded. The minutes are approved as submitted.

The proposed meeting dates for 2015 were discussed. Next meeting will be in Staunton, Virginia on February 26-27, 2015.

Nomination Committee Chair, Nikki Tinsley, motioned for nominations for Charlie Stek as Chair and Bob Wayland as Vice-Chair. Verna Harrison seconded followed by a unanimous vote from the committee.

The CAC members discussed future meeting topics that included: Nutrient Management Plans, RMPs, monitoring, MS4 renewals, stormwater, updates on Anne Arundel County, population growth, agriculture and land use projections, stewardship updates, and management strategy updates.

With no further business the meeting adjourned at 12:03pm.