

Factor 1: BMP Implementation

Action #	Description	Performance Target(s)	Can you speak to any progress on this item?	Red/Green/Yellow: Do you concur with the color coding on this item? If not, please explain.	Are there lessons learned you want to offer related to this action item?	Next Steps: Do you feel your group and the WQGIT should retain this action for the next two years? (Y/N/Maybe). Please explain your reasoning and any suggestions that can make the action more specific or actionable if it is retained.
1	<p>Provide more “boots on the ground” support to address identified technical assistance needs expressed by the state and local jurisdictions</p> <p>Consider expanding circuit rider type programs to deliver technical assistance.</p> <p>Develop BMP verification and</p>	<p>Number of staff increases or providers to deliver technical assistance</p> <p>Number of trainings for the Data Dashboard and verification</p>				

	Data Dashboard training					
2	Continue to update implementation costs on a regular basis	Updated costs in CAST 2021				
3	Potential refinements to the partnership's BMP Verification framework document, including potential approval of alternative verification methodologies and re-verification	Updated partnership's BMP verification framework	<p>The BMPVAHAT met from August 2020 to March 2022. Though the pain points in the framework were discussed, no refinements were proposed by the membership.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>AgWG Comments:</p> <p>AgWG is currently reviewing concerns from PA regarding use of roadside transect surveys and producer surveys for tracking and verifying various cover crop BMPs.</p> <p>FWG: No.</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>FWG: Yes</p>	<p>Because some members disagree with the overall structure of the CBPO and the way BMPs are verified and implemented, it was difficult to get collaboration on revising the verification framework.</p> <p>Understood where the pain points are – 1) Lack of access to federal data 2) Personnel to conduct verification 3) Access to operations within the states (producer can deny access).</p> <p>-----</p>	<p>The WQGIT should retain this item, but the BMPVAHAT is not the appropriate place for the conversation, as the necessary expertise is not on that group. 1) The BMP Verification Committee and BMP Verification Review Panel developed the body of the verification framework. A group with the similar (if not exact) membership should be reconvened to discuss the body of the verification framework. 2) The BMP Verification Guidance source sector appendices were developed by the source sector workgroups. These appendices should be altered by the source sector workgroups. 3) The BMP Verification framework was approved by the PSC. If the framework is altered, the changes will</p>

					<p>AgWG Comments: Recent concerns related to the BMP verification framework have come to light in EPA reviews of annual BMP progress. It is critical that potential issues with jurisdictions' verification procedures are addressed early and potential resolutions proposed promptly to the appropriate audience.</p> <p>FWG: N/A</p>	<p>need to be agreed upon and approved by the PSC.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>AgWG Comments:</p> <p>Was this action directed specifically to the AgWG? This was taken up in large part by the BMPVAHAT formed by the WQGIT. Refinements should be considered as issues are raised. A standing item per commitment to adaptive management by the CBP.</p> <p>FWG: Yes, Verification needs constant attention.</p>
4	Reassess and update BMP credit durations as determined by the BMP verification ad-hoc action team and the WQGIT	Final recommendations for BMP credit durations	The BMPVAHAT developed and approved a proposal with the forestry workgroup for extending the credit duration of forest and tree BMPs.	<p>Yes.</p> <p>----</p> <p>AgWG Comments:</p> <p>N/A. This was assigned to the BMPVAHAT.</p> <p>FWG: Unsure</p>	<p>The Source Sector workgroups under the WQGIT and the WTWG were the groups to define and assign credit durations to BMPs. These groups should be the ones to reassess the credit durations</p>	<p>I feel the WQGIT should retain this item, but the BMPVAHAT is not the appropriate place to discuss it. This should be the responsibility of the source sectors for assigning credit durations and the WTWG for determining if credit durations are still the best</p>

			<p>The BMPVAHAT developed a proposal for extending the wetland credit durations with the wetland workgroup. This proposal received comments from the BMPVAHAT membership. These comments may be addressed by the Wetlands WG in July 2022.</p> <p>The BMPVAHAT developed a proposal for partial credit that did not achieve consensus.</p> <p>The BMPVAHAT developed a proposal for extended the credit durations of barnyard runoff control and loafing lot management practices that did not reach consensus.</p>		<p>within their applicable source sectors.</p> <p>Some source sectors were concerned about equity across source sectors where some source sectors would have more lenient verification methods. Each source sector needs to work within the limitations that are imposed on them. This means verification frequency will differ from sector to sector.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>AgWG Comments:</p> <p>BMP credit durations are a manifestation of the Verification Framework and its goal of assigning credibility to the mechanisms of</p>	<p>way of applying the verification framework.</p> <p>AgWG Comments:</p> <p>No .This was assigned to the BMPVAHAT. The AgWG took no action on this beyond providing leadership representation on the BMPVAHAT meetings and providing feedback on the ultimate partial credit proposal from the BMPVAHAT. It became clear very quickly that the issue of credit durations was a distraction from greater concerns regarding the feasibility of tracking and verifying non-point source BMPs, particularly in the ag sector. CBP efforts to align monitoring data with modeling output and assessment of that alignment needs to occur before further discussion of verification.</p> <p>FWG: No.</p>
--	--	--	---	--	--	---

			<p>-----</p> <p>AgWG Comments:</p> <p>No need to update BMP credit duration was raised within the AgWG, where CBP agricultural expertise resides. The AgWG agreed on BMP credit durations in preparation for Phase 6 in 2015 and within the guidelines laid out in the Verification Framework. Ag Decisions on P6 Model.</p> <p>FWG: Yes, decisions were made about buffer credit durations.</p>		<p>tracking and reporting BMPs. The AgWG credit durations were determined in that spirit.</p> <p>FWG: n/a</p>	
5	Understand how volunteers or citizen stewardship can be used to alleviate capacity shortfalls for BMP verification	Increased on-the-ground support of verification efforts	This topic was not assigned to the BMPVAHAT and was not discussed at length during workgroup meetings.	Yes.	N/A. Progress has not been made on this within the BMPVAHAT.	Yes. However, this would be a new charge for the BMPVAHAT. In addition, if the BMPVAHAT were to be convened to address this, the membership will need to be revisited. This conversation should be in

						partnership with the stewardship workgroup, as this would be a citizen science component. This task would require GIT funding to develop research methods and identify a pilot community.
6	Explore funding to continue supporting BMP expert panels	Funding delivered to initiate new BMP expert panels	AgWG Comments: No. Unaware this was assigned to the AgWG. AgWG continues to explore the impact of previously incorporated Expert Panel recommendations on BMP crediting and pollutant load estimates per jurisdictional request. FWG: No	AgWG Comments: No. Change to red. Message received from EPA to not discuss new Expert Panels due to lack of funding. FWG: Unsure	N/A	AgWG Comments: Yes, at the WQGIT level. EPA indicated on the last MB meeting that funding will become available again for future Expert Panels. A concerted effort should be made to ensure limited funding is going to highest priority items. FWG: Yes, currently looking into expert panels
7	Potential refinements to the partnership's BMP Expert Panel Protocols	Updated BMP Expert Panel Protocol				
8	Working with the CBP Communications	Adoption and implementation of natural				

Commented [SH1]: From Sophia Waterman: Huge need to focus on WQ activities that have habitat and climate benefits as well as WQ.

Commented [HJ2]: Approval by WQGIT expected 6/27/22

	Office, build awareness (e.g., communication materials, trainings) of natural resource BMPs (e.g., wetlands, forest buffers, and tree planting) with water quality co-benefits that are lagging in implementation	resource BMPs (via annual progress submissions)				
9	Update CAST to incorporate optimization tools	Adoption of optimization tool into CAST	Yes, progress is excellent and we're on track as per the work plan to produce and optimization tool for the CBP in 2025.	Green with completion in 2025	No, ongoing task.	Yes, ongoing task. Suggested edit of Performance Target: "Adoption of optimization tool." Olivia noted that it not going to be integrate with CAST and will have own user interface.
10	Increase number of CAST training and users with a focus on showing how to target BMPs	Number of CAST trainings and number of times recorded trainings are used (H)	Yes, Helen has responsibility for planning monthly webinars/training, and is responding to user requests for specific topics	Green. Tracking is being conducted and communication about trainings has increased. Targeting BMPs is a topic that is covered on a regular basis.	Feedback from users on topics of interest is helpful in planning relevant future webinars/trainings.	Yes, webinars/trainings will continue to take place. It would be helpful for the Communications Team to put out information on social media about CAST and the trainings. Some recorded trainings are just minutes long and available online.
11	Create an ad hoc group associated with the modelling	Modeling framework for crediting air	Yes, this task is essentially complete with an	Yes.	No.	No, task completed.

Commented [HJ3]: Outcome attainability for wetland and forest buffers has been elevated over the last 2 years and PSC-requested workshops are occurring in summer/fall of 2022.

Commented [GS5]: What does this mean? Is green 'on schedule' or 'finished'? Is yellow 'in progress' or 'behind schedule'?

Commented [HJ4]: This is now a longer term workplan, part of Phase 7 model development

Commented [HJ6]: "Targeting reductions" webinar is available under "Develop a Plan" videos here: <https://cast.chesapeakebay.net/Learning/FreeTrainingVideos>

Additionally, there are other targeting resources in development through the partnership, for example: <https://gis.chesapeakebay.net/targeting/>

	workgroup to revisit the WIP atmospheric deposition crediting methodology, so that these practices can become part of the states' WIP reduction portfolio	deposition as part of the WIPs and Bay TMDL	updated CMAQ Airshed Model tool reviewed and accepted by the Modeling WG on July 12.			
--	---	---	--	--	--	--

FACTOR 2: Funding for Implementation

Action #	Description	Performance Target(s)	Can you speak to any progress on this item?	Red/Green/Yellow: Do you concur with the color coding on this item? If not, please explain.	Are there lessons learned you want to offer related to this action item?	Next Steps: Do you feel your group and the WQGIT should retain this action for the next two years? (Y/N/Maybe). Please explain your reasoning and any suggestions that can make the action more specific or actionable if it is retained.
1	Increase awareness (e.g., providing presentations and resource materials to the	Increased leveraging of available funding resources	EPA hosted four presentations in 2020 and two in 2021 on using the Clean Water State Revolving	Yes.	EPA and the CBP partnership should continue to communicate the benefits of using of the CWSRF program	Research suggests that conservation partners may be unaware of the needs and barriers that underserved producers face when accessing loan funding.

	<p>CBP partnership) of the SRF program to increase coordination and leverage opportunities for NPS implementation</p>		<p>Fund (CWSRF) program to reduce nutrients and sediment through nonpoint source implementation. EPA and NRCS held a local workshop on July 29, 2021 where successful approaches for using CWSRF to fund agriculture conservation practices was showcased. In 2022 EPA, MD and DE conservation districts held webinars to share success stories and discuss opportunities to use CWSRF to finance agriculture conservation practices. EPA is conducting research to</p>		<p>to implement nonpoint source practices to meet partnership goals. EPA should complete its research on successful marketing approaches and the CBP partnership should use the lessons learned to communicate the use of CWSRF funds to achieve its implementation goals. Continued engagement, collaboration and information sharing between state partners and EPA CWSRF staff will be valuable for improving access to loan funding.</p>	<p>Recommend additional outreach conducted in partnership with USDA and NRCS underserved farmer programs, local community food justice/urban agriculture organizations and Tribal partners may improve access to financing.</p>
--	---	--	---	--	--	---

			identify successful approaches for marketing and using CWSRF for agricultural conservation practices.			
2	Identify and discuss dedicated funding streams for technical assistance providers	Increased funding for technical assistance delivery in the agricultural sector				
3	Continue to support implementing Phase III WIPs and 2-year milestones	Increased implementation	EPA continues to provide funding through the jurisdictions' Bay grants on an annual basis. Most Effective Basin funding and the new Infrastructure funding provides an increase in funding to support WIP	Agree – Green.	Discussions are ongoing about potentially streamlining grant reporting requirements. Also, the match requirement has been waived for the first year under the infrastructure grants.	These funding actions are ongoing as part of EPA's authority under the Clean Water Act. EPA continues to meet with the jurisdictions to discuss these funding opportunities, as well as the through the CBPO Grant Guidance review process.

Commented [HJ7]: ?

			and milestone implementation. Lastly, funding has been increased for NFWF's Small Watershed Grants and Innovative Nutrient and Sediment Reduction Grants.			
4	Identify lessons learned from the Conowingo WIP financing strategy and determine if there are opportunities elsewhere in the watershed	Increased funding to support BMP implementation, particularly in the agricultural sector				
	Create pay for performance program proposal					
	Identify full-scale regional case studies to bring to the CBP					

Commented [HJ8]: ?

	partnership for presentation					
5	Discuss development of incentive structures, working with NRCS, to launch pay-for-performance programs	Creation of a pay-for-performance program(s)				

FACTOR 3: Communication and Coordination

Action #	Description	Performance Target(s)	Can you speak to any progress on this item?	Red/Green/Yellow: Do you concur with the color coding on this item? If not, please explain.	Are there lessons learned you want to offer related to this action item?	Next Steps: Do you feel your group and the WQGIT should retain this action for the next two years? (Y/N/Maybe). Please explain your reasoning and any suggestions that can make the action more specific or actionable if it is retained.
1	Build on the work of the DEIJ Action Team and work with the relevant teams (Diversity, Communications) to identify and engage	Increased engagement from under-represented communities	<p>[DWG Coordinator] I don't think the WQ GIT has directly collaborated with DWG or LGAC on obtaining a list of potential members/nominees</p> <p>The DWG keeps a record of groups that are run by or underrepresented/traditionally</p>	I agree	More direct communication and collaboration between our groups	

	<p>under-represented groups</p> <p>Obtain a list of potential members/nominees (e.g., LGAC) from under-represented groups to participate in the WQGIT and its source sector workgroups</p>		<p>excluded identities. The DWG 2022 CStREAM interns are working on turning that list into an ArcGIS layer</p> <p>[LGAC Coord.] LGAC is one source but not the only source for under represented groups - LGAC is local elected officials, and WQGIT and its WGs are likely too detailed in content for local decision makers--I know this only lists LGAC as an example but I suggest also including the Diversity WG, potentially CAC as well as STAC.</p>			
2	<p>Create trainings in underserved agricultural areas on the Chesapeake Bay TMDL and WIPs process, including an overview of funding opportunities</p>	<p>Increased funding opportunities and awareness for underserved areas</p> <p>Increased implementation in underserved areas as a result of engagement</p>	<p>I wouldn't be able to confirm if this has happened or what progress has been made toward this action.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>AgWG Comments:</p> <p>Unaware this action was assigned to the AgWG.</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>-----</p> <p>AgWG Comments: Yes.</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>-----</p> <p>AgWG Comments:</p> <p>Unaware this action was assigned to the AgWG.</p>	<p>Keep.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>AgWG Comments:</p> <p>Yes. Communication has been critically lacking in agricultural areas related to all CBP matters. Definition of "underserved" in this context would be helpful.</p>

Commented [JP9]: Comment from Loretta on AgWG related action items: "The AgWG coordinator was unaware of these assignments."

						Given the discussions regarding agricultural data that have grown with each CAST update, it is imperative that CBP dedicated more time and resources to effectively communicating with ag stakeholders.
3	Develop factsheets or webinars to explain local water quality trends for underserved areas of the watershed	Increased implementation in underserved areas as a result of engagement		USGS: Yes, Yellow.		
4	Develop a factsheet explaining opportunities to advance DEIJ values into grant funding opportunities (see fact sheet developed by the Wetlands Workgroup for an example)	Increased funding opportunities and awareness for underserved areas	I cant confirm if WQ GIT has produced their own factsheet. Many agencies have already begun to advance DEIJ The 2022 Diversity workgroup GIT funding project is working on convening funders and under resourced to share these resources, best practices and opportunities		More direct communication and collaboration between WQGIT and Diversity WG.	Keep.

Commented [SH12]: From Breck Sullivan: Performance target doesn't match well with the action description. USGS can develop the factsheet/webinar for the science aspect, but they can not recommend or implement specific implementation.

Commented [HJ10]: There's been a lot of work on the tools and info (through Ches EJSscreen and tributary summaries) but not necessarily this exact action

Commented [SH11]: From Breck Sullivan: Does John Clune's Nitrogen report/video comment on underserved areas at all?

Commented [HJ13]: Did we do this?

5	Help implement a CBP social science strategy	Achievement of objectives in social science strategy	In order to evaluate and determine next steps for social science integration, a GIT funding project was put forth to fund a social science assessment of the partnership to determine gaps, opportunities and needs that align with social science theories and tools. The assessment will be complete in Fall/Winter 2022.	Green	Lessons learned and recommendations from the assessment will be shared when report is complete.	Once the recommendations in the final report are identified, perhaps WQGIT could work to implement a particular action. This is TBD.
6	Identify a WQGIT representative(s) to participate on the Community Advisory Board and to help contribute to the DELJ implementation plan	Begin institutionalizing DELJ approaches into WQGIT decisions				
7	Identify a WQGIT representative to engage and coordinate with LGAC as a means of information and knowledge exchange	Number of meetings with LGAC	This might be best at a staff level with Jeremy and I checking in periodically. We can decide on discussion topics at LGAC meetings.			
8	Focus a GIT meeting to identify ways to strengthen coordination	Increased coordination on	Another great idea--Jeremy is on the Local Engagement group and represents WQGIT well. I offer a conversation			

Commented [HJ14]: Does the behavior change website count or is this something broader?

Commented [HJ15]: DELJ strategy is complete. Is Community Advisory Board operational?

	between all levels of government	restoration efforts	with Laura Cattell Noll in addition as she is the lead on a GIT funded project developing relationships with planners. There is some extra \$ in that project and decisions are being made now on conference sessions, a planners Summit or some version of additional engagement with planners. While this L&A Plan suggests a GIT meeting to identify ways to strengthen, including planners would be highly beneficial and Laura may have some ideas.			
--	----------------------------------	---------------------	--	--	--	--

FACTOR 4: CAST and Other Model Updates

Action #	Description	Performance Target(s)	Can you speak to any progress on this item?	Red/Green/Yellow: Do you concur with the color coding on this item? If not, please explain.	Are there lessons learned you want to offer related to this action item?	Next Steps: Do you feel your group and the WQGIT should retain this action for the next two years? (Y/N/Maybe). Please explain your reasoning and any suggestions that can make the action more specific or actionable if it is retained.
1	Implement and complete the CAST 2021 work plan	Finalization of CAST 2021 for management application				
2	Identify a WQGIT representative to work with the Communications team to assist in explaining the various model updates and their impacts and benefits, as well as release an article/press release about the updates	Increased understanding of CAST updates and impacts to restoration efforts				

Commented [HJ16]: Achieved: https://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/42029/cast21workplan_final_083121.pdf

Commented [HJ17]: Communication materials have been developed for CAST19 and CAST21, though the WQGIT did not identify a representative for this purpose.

3	Once CAST 21 is updated create webinars for more novice users to explain changes	Increased understanding of CAST updates and impacts to restoration efforts				
4	Build in Partnership-approved products of the BMP Verification Ad-Hoc Action Team related to credit duration	Finalization of CAST 2021 for management application	The only decision that was approved by consensus through the WQGIT was the decision to extend forest and tree practice credit durations. This decision has been included into the	No. The partnership approved “products” (extension to forestry and tree practice credit durations) were included in CAST-21. Any additional products will be included in future model updates.	The BMPVAHAT needed to enlist the help and participation of the source sector workgroup in order to be successful on this item.	Yes. The BMPVAHAT leadership is currently working to finalize the wetland credit duration recommendation with an ad-hoc team formed out of the wetland workgroup.
5	Request that STAR and the Modeling Workgroup investigate methods of refining the spatial resolution of the TMDL accounting	Release CAST21 with new functionality to create and evaluate plans with BMPs at a finer scale	These are three different tasks: 1) methods of refining the spatial resolution of the TMDL accounting system, 2) refine nutrient speciation accounting, and 3) begin development of an estuarine	Needs to be divided into three tasks and each will be a color code. STAR: Yellow	Needs to be divided into three separate tasks. STAR: Better alignment is needed for applying tidal monitoring results to	Needs to be divided into three separate tasks. STAR: Yes CAST21 hasn't been released. The development of an estuarine model with improved shallow water simulation involves building Multiple Tributary Model teams. They have the following timeline:

Commented [JP18]: Comment from Vanessa regarding all BMPVAHAT specific action items: “The BMPVAHAT was formed with a specific charge. The items listed above need to be delegated to the appropriate groups and a group similar to the BMP Verification Committee which would have the ability to alter the framework (with approval from the PSC).”

Commented [GS23]: All three colors are green. The due date on all three is 12/2025. MWG is actively working on 1 and 3 and will be working on 2 sometime in the 2023-2025 period

	system, refine nutrient speciation accounting, and begin development of an estuarine model with improved shallow water simulation		model with improved shallow water simulation. They need to be broken out into separate tasks in order to be addressed.		inform the estuary modeling efforts.	2025 Fully Operational, 2026 CBP Review, and 2027 CBP Application
			STAR: The Modeling Workgroup is developing an estuarine model with improved shallow water simulation.			
			CAST21 has not been released due to continued discussion and consensus among the partnership			
6	Understand the time it takes for different tidal segments to achieve water-quality	Release CAST21 with new functionality to create and evaluate plans	This was done with the Phase 6 Model and presented to the PSC December 2017. Therefore, I assume this task is	Yellow is fine but a little meaningless b/c the completion of the Phase 7 models is needed before the task can be done in	No, this is SOP.	Yes but completion of the task is not until 2026. Suggested rewording of the performance target: "Release Phase 7 dynamic watershed model and estuarine model with new

Commented [HJ20]: Seems like we're doing the Action, but I'm not sure about the performance target

Commented [GS21]: All three tasks being tracked on the P7 page:
https://www.chesapeakebay.net/what/programs/modeling/phase_7_model_development

Commented [HJ19]: Seems like we're doing the Action, but I'm not sure about the performance target

Commented [SH22]: From Breck Sullivan: Please refer to the Modeling Workgroups response to this action item.

Commented [GS25]: Should be green. We are on schedule.

	standards to better understand responses to restoration efforts in the watershed	with BMPs at a finer scale	for the Phase 7 site of models. This will be done for Phase 7 in 2026. STAR: CAST21 has not been released.	2026. [BTW: We don't mean "time to achieve WQs," we mean "nutrient load needed to achieve WQs"] STAR: Red		functionality to address lag times in the watershed and estuary." STAR: Does the performance target fit the description?
						Yes, this should be included, but it should be included in the Factor, "Water Quality Monitoring: Sustain and enhance monitoring and interpretation of results to help understand water quality response to management actions." Performance Targets should be more targeted to monitoring such as, "use more monitoring results and interpretations to assess progress toward water-quality goals."
7	Provide CAST and other training to interested stakeholders	Increased understanding of CAST updates and impacts to restoration efforts	Knowledge transfer was conducted individually with each state and with the Partnership through several WG and WQGIT meetings. Individual CAST Q&As can be scheduled on request. Replies to CAST Help emails occur within 24 hours. There are also timelines that	Green. This has been done for CAST-2021 and will be done again with any interim or future updates to CAST.	Clear and consistent communication is required.	Yes, ongoing training opportunities available.

Commented [GS26]: We should find this out. My changes to column 3 are premised on taking the description as written.

Commented [SH24]: From Breck Sullivan: It appears the Modeling Workgroup provided their own comments on how to change the performance targets which seems to match better.

The action description falls in line with the Water Quality Standards Attainment and Monitoring Outcome, but the Performance Target doesn't match. If you are going to keep with the descriptor then the performance target needs to be changed.

			explain which version of CAST is used for each TMDL evaluation on.			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

FACTOR 5: Water Quality Monitoring: Sustain and enhance monitoring and interpretation of results to help understand water quality response to management actions.

Action #	Description	Performance Target(s)	Can you speak to any progress on this item?	Red/Green/Yellow: Do you concur with the color coding on this item? If not, please explain.	Are there lessons learned you want to offer related to this action item?	Next Steps: Do you feel your group and the WQGIT should retain this action for the next two years? (Y/N/Maybe). Please explain your reasoning and any suggestions that can make the action more specific or actionable if it is retained.
1	Provide technical assistance to Bay jurisdictions to understand water quality monitoring trends in priority watersheds to further target	Increased implementation in targeted areas to achieve water quality standards, using monitoring trends information	STAR: ITAT has been active showcasing the tributary summaries. USGS led jurisdictional meetings to interact with states and	STAR: Yellow not Green	STAR: ITAT has presented on the tributary summaries, but we need more input on how they are being utilized to help us plan	STAR: Yes. Providing technical assistance to Bay jurisdictions will help them integrating monitoring data into their decision making and will help inform priorities for analysis on watershed-estuary integration topics.

	implementation efforts		provide technical assistance. USGS produced presentation product to help explain factors affecting trends with an emphasis on response to management efforts. EPA was unable to assist in these meetings.		content and format for updating them. Asking Alex and Jimmy for their lessons learned.	More support from partners is needed to hold these jurisdictional meetings.
2	Incorporate more monitoring trends and loads data into assessment of progress toward outcome (e.g., Bay Barometer)	Reporting from jurisdictions regarding how monitoring data is incorporated into decisions regarding implementation	EPA continues to work closely with USGS and other partners on incorporating the latest monitoring and trends information; the latest update (through 2020) was the inclusion of	Suggesting yellow color coding. USGS: Yes, green.	Discussions are ongoing amongst the partnership on additional ways to use monitoring data to measure progress. While monitoring data is used to inform the partnership's	Yes, this should continue to be a part of this plan as monitoring information has been identified as a critical component to understanding the Bay and ecosystem's response to management actions. In addition, discussions are underway to more closely align the 2025 WIP outcome and the water quality standards and attainment outcome. USGS: Yes. This action improves understanding and communication

Commented [HJ27]: ITAT has been active, developing tributary summaries with a wealth of monitoring and trend data.

Commented [SH28]: From Breck for USGS: please see response from STAR/ Modeling WG

Commented [HJ29]: Unsure on this status

			<p>this information into EPA's evaluation of the 2020-2021/2022-2023 milestone evaluations.</p> <p>USGS: Development of nontidal load indicator – assessment of progress towards the goal (Doesn't affect how things are implemented)</p> <p>Interactive presentation on factors affecting trends with emphasis on response to management efforts.</p>		<p>suite of modeling tools, there are continued concerns with relying solely on the model to measure progress towards 2025 WIP outcome attainment.</p> <p>USGS: Input still needed here.</p>	<p>of factors affecting the water-quality and influence on management actions which continue to need to be implemented. These communication products help jurisdictions utilize the long-term data for decision making.</p> <p>The Performance target is interesting worded because we do not have compile/report all the ways jurisdictions use the data. We answered based on the action description because USGS can contribute to communication products. The performance target speaks to the jurisdictions reporting out not USGS.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

3	Use monitoring data to target practices to demonstrate success	Increased implementation in targeted areas to achieve water quality standards, using monitoring trends information				
---	--	--	--	--	--	--

Commented [HJ30]: Unsure on this

FACTOR 6: Using Co-benefits as a catalyst to increase implementation by aligning with priorities and goals beyond water quality.

Action #	Description	Performance Target(s)	Can you speak to any progress on this item?	Red/Green/Yellow: Do you concur with the color coding on this item? If not, please explain.	Are there lessons learned you want to offer related to this action item?	Next Steps: Do you feel your group and the WQGIT should retain this action for the next two years? (Y/N/Maybe). Please explain your reasoning and any suggestions that can make the action more specific or actionable if it is retained.
1	Work with other GITs to develop funded projects that provide co-	Number of projects with WQ and other co-benefits.				

	benefits and integrate climate resiliency, habitat protection, and reductions of contaminants into the implementation of water quality BMPs					
2	Work with financial experts to develop information that monetizes cost savings by implementing projects with co-benefits	Number of projects with WQ and other co-benefits.				
3	Develop a few specific examples as a demonstration using projects with low implementation levels (e.g., wetlands, tree planting, forest buffers)	Number of projects with WQ and other co-benefits.				

4	Use co-benefits as a tool to fund and accelerate BMP implementation efforts	Number of projects with WQ and other co-benefits.				
---	---	---	--	--	--	--

FACTOR 7: Climate Change Tracking

Action #	Description	Performance Target(s)	Can you speak to any progress on this item?	Red/Green/Yellow: Do you concur with the color coding on this item? If not, please explain.	Are there lessons learned you want to offer related to this action item?	Next Steps: Do you feel your group and the WQGIT should retain this action for the next two years? (Y/N/Maybe). Please explain your reasoning and any suggestions that can make the action more specific or actionable if it is retained.
1	Integrate the STAC technical synthesis on climate resilient and adapted BMPs and management	Specific and programmatic milestones to address climate effects.				

	actions into communications to jurisdictions for meaningful decision-making	Specific BMPs to address climate effects				
2	Update Intensity-Duration-Frequency curves (IDFs) for all counties in the Chesapeake watershed and encourage the adoption and implementation of the updated IDFs for stormwater and other applications	Quantification and integration of co-benefits into CAST and optimization decision support tools	Yes, good progress has been made on this task and an RFA will be released this year that will expand on the progress described in the links below: Online tool: https://midatlantic-idf.rcc-acis.org/ GIT-funding project report: https://cbtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/17726_RAND_Final-IDF-Curve-Report_July2021.pdf	Yes, green is good.	No, good progress being made.	Yes, it will be worthwhile tracking progress on this.
3	Work with the Federal Facilities Workgroup to determine federal role in meeting climate reductions	Specific and programmatic milestones to address climate effects. Specific BMPs to address climate effects				

Commented [HJ31]: Report complete, but more work needed

Commented [HJ32]: Online tool: <https://midatlantic-idf.rcc-acis.org/>

GIT-funding project report:
https://cbtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/17726_RAND_Final-IDF-Curve-Report_July2021.pdf

Commented [HJ33]: Superseded by the Climate Directive and the subsequent workplan?