

**Management Committee Meeting Notes**  
**Thursday, July 23, 2020**  
**Meeting conducted remotely due to COVID-19**



**Attendees**

Mark Tedesco, EPA LISO  
Nikki Tachiki, EPA LISO  
Cayla Sullivan, EPA LISO  
Mel Cote, EPA R1  
Bessie Wright, EPA R1  
MaryJo Feuerbach, EPA R1  
Richard Balla, EPA R2  
Gabriella Panayotakis, EPA R2  
Robin Parker, EPA HQ  
Darcy Lonsdale, STAC/NY  
Paul Stacey, STAC  
Nancy Seligson, CAC/NY  
Holly Drinkuth, CAC/CT  
Harry Yamalis, CTDEEP

Mark Parker, CTDEEP  
Phil Trowbridge, CTDEEP  
Erik Bedan, CTDEEP  
James Gilmore, NYSDEC  
Casey Personius, NYSDEC  
Sue Van Patten, NYSDEC  
Julia Socrates, NYSDEC/MHP  
Victoria O'Neill, NYSDEC/NEIWPC  
Kristin Krasieski, NYSDEC/NEIWPC  
Rebecca Shuford, NYSG  
Jimena Perez-Viscasillas, NYSG  
Gina Behnke, NYCDEP

Leslie Lipton, NYCDEP  
Kevin O'Brien, CTDEP  
Kathleen Knight, CTDEP  
Sylvain De Guise, CTSG  
Judy Preston, LISS/CTSG  
Richard Friesner, NEIWPC  
Audra Martin, NEIWPC  
Jim Ammerman, LISS/NEIWPC  
Susan Sullivan, NEIWPC  
Suzanne Paton, USFWS  
Nancy Ferlow, USDA-NRCS  
Thomas Morgart, CT NRCS  
Jeffery Barbaro, USGS  
Gary Wikfors, NOAA

**Introduction:**

Mark Tedesco called the meeting to order at approximately 9:00am and introduced everyone present in the Microsoft Teams Meeting. The outcomes of today's meeting are to review the assessment of the 2015 CCMP and the update of IAs for the 2020 CCMP, and to finalize some IAs, through a detailed discussion, that needed more feedback from the management committee. No proposed additions or changes to the agenda. No comments on the April (2020) Management Committee notes.

**Science and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) Update provided by Jim Ammerman:**

- Jim Ammerman: STAC met online on June 19, 2020 to address two major themes: ocean acidification and coastal resiliency. Talks were given by Samantha Siedlecki, University of Connecticut, on "Modeling and magnitude extent and potential impacts of acidification on the northeast Shelf: Implications for the Long Island Sound Region"; Tom Shyka, NERACOOS, presenting on ocean acidification activities and modeling efforts; and Larry Swanson on the New York Ocean Acidification Task Force. Additionally, Nikki Tachiki, Mark Tedesco and Jim Ammerman presented on the updating IAs for the 2020 CCMP. Finally, Sea Grant Directors, Becky Shuford and Sylvain De Guise, presented on their new working group for sustainable and resilient communities, and focused on themes, objectives, and proposed activities for Year 1.

**Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) Update provided by Nancy Seligson and Holly Drinkuth:**

- Holly Drinkuth: CAC met online on June 11, 2020 and welcomed the two newly appointed CAC liaisons from the STAC: Jamie Vaudrey & Kamazima Lwiza. They discussed how difficult the

last three months have been in relation to both racial injustice and COVID-19. This gave the group the opportunity to discuss environmental justice in the 2020 CCMP updated IAs. Additionally, a new member joined the CAC - Eastern Connecticut Conservation District. The group reviewed the 2015 CCMP report to Congress with Nikki Tachiki, which facilitated a detailed discussion of IAs. They took this as an opportunity to further discuss priorities among the public and the work the CAC has been conducting to include in the 5-year update. Becky Shuford and Sylvain De Guise presented on the Sustainable and Resilient Communities Working Group objectives. Finally, CAC had conversations in their policy subcommittee update, in which the first topic was related to circulating a letter to congressional representatives about the environmental benefits to the Long Island Sound in relation to opportunities with the stimulus bill, and they wrote letters to both states about the plastic bag re-instatement. In response, Connecticut did put the policy back in place on July 1.

- Nancy Seligson: For the updates on IAs for 2020 CCMP, the CAC broke into subgroups, and were prompted with questions as they reviewed IAs to help with feedback. Additionally, the group had their meetings with LIS Caucus members on Congress in March 2020 to discuss what the ask should be for the upcoming federal budget and agreed upon \$30 million. Subsequently, the House of Representatives has passed a budget for \$30.4 million for Long Island Sound.
- Follow-up:
  - Holly Drinkuth: CAC had a conversation with STAC and are planning to hold a joint meeting in September 2020. The CAC and STAC subsequently agreed to hold a joint remote meeting in September.

### **2020 Final Work Plan and budget decisions; award package issues needing resolution – Mark Tedesco**

- Mark Tedesco: Updates about the 2020 Final Work Plan and Budget:
  - Used some of the FY20 Funds to support the addition of EPA staff (Cayla Sullivan). This was the first time using some of the Long Island Sound Appropriations for EPA staff.
  - We need to improve oversight and coordination of modeling work and had discussed bringing additional EPA staff to support that, and, in addition, developing an interagency agreement with USGS. In response, we did establish an interagency agreement with USGS, in which Jeff Barbaro is the lead of those discussion.
    - Jeff Barbaro: Provided background on the agreement, in which he will be one of the people coordinating effort and will also involve USGS staff from New England and New York with the appropriate expertise (and nationwide if need be). Collaboration will be used to develop a system wide model, including data management aspects, data sources (e.g., freshwater nutrient inputs), and technical oversight and peer-reviewed edits.
  - We approved funds for an update to the stormwater manuals for Connecticut and New York; however, during a subsequent meeting, NYSDEC informed us they did not need funding for update, and have already made progress updating the manual, specifically changing rainfall patterns. Instead, as there is still ample work to support an update of the CTDEEP stormwater manual, we provided the overall project funds to Connecticut. There is a total federal budget of \$21.66 million. Recipients are providing match in excess of the required amount. It is critical to receive an overmatch in order to meet overall aggregate match requirements and support more Future Funds and research projects – thank you to CTDEEP, NYSDEC, and IEC.

- Please refer to FY20 Budget by Organization document

### 2015 CCMP Tracking and Reporting – Nikki Tachiki

- Nicole Tachiki: Presented on the status of 2015-2019 IA tracking, the utility of the tracking tool to develop the 2015 CCMP Evaluation Report (e.g., Report to Congress), and status of the 2015 CCMP Evaluation Report. (See PowerPoint presentation for details of this section.)
- Casey Personius: Presented on an overview of the draft text for the 2020 Congressional Report Clean Waters and Healthy Watersheds. (See PowerPoint presentation for details of this section.)
- Mark Tedesco: Opened the floor for discussion on the presentations. Pointed out that the report to Congress is ultimately one piece of the evaluation as the communication component is most important. However, a detailed spreadsheet and analysis of the individual IAs, and detailed review and discussion of Ecosystem Targets will be posted on website.
- Mel Cote: There are 9 IAs where there has been no progress – is there any discussion as to what efforts must be taken to start and progress those actions?
- Casey Personius: It is only 9%, which is 3 IAs. We do discuss in the narrative one specific IA, riparian corridors, and why it is hard to progress. We explain that we have protected lands to implement corridors but may have to accelerate work specifically contributing to riparian corridors. We do not specifically state the status of each IA as they are long and take up space, but we do address another of the 3 IAs without progress, stating that there are preliminary actions underway that will pave the way for progress down the road.
- Mark Tedesco: We do not intend for the report to be of a detailed evaluation of each IA, but we need to be honest as to needed next steps based on progress and identify challenges to overcome to improve in the future.
- Paul Stacey: Thank you Nikki and Casey for your work. Is the message of the report going to be as good as the progress we made? For example, will the report identify what has been completed, and at what cost? For example, will the big investments in nitrogen reductions and subsequent reduction in the area of hypoxia be emphasized? This is what legislatures want to discuss. Success stories will help this idea.
- Casey Personius: When we say complete/significant progress, we are referring to a percentage of actions rather than individual IAs. For each IA to reach that level of completeness, there must be a multitude of projects from numerous organization that made that IA complete, and pulling all that information, especially the financial side, would be difficult. We are looking to do that in the future, by allowing partner organizations to input that information online.
- Paul Stacey: Suggested using graphics to portray this idea, by incorporating IAs, financial costs, and environmental results.
- Mark Tedesco: Agreed. The report being drafted takes this approach in which we provide graphics of IAs and ecosystem targets. In the text, we do emphasize the important progress and huge investment that has been made, specifically in nitrogen reduction. Additionally, we highlight ecosystem target improvements. There is an enormous amount of detail we can provide but need to communicate the big picture. The detailed spreadsheets will be posted on website, including cost analysis of the 2015 CCMP.

- Phil Trowbridge: We should connect this to other initiatives the study is working on such as the communications plan. This is the foundation for communications and outreach and should use it as a building block for outreach to municipalities and other organizations. Also relates to the strategic planning of the management committee, where we describe successes and looking ahead. We should think of the report as something broader than to just Congress.
- Mark Tedesco: Agreed – the “looking ahead” part of the publication is a teaser but meant to reflect what we want to emphasize, and what we will be investing time, money, and effort in the next 5 years.
- Mark Parker: The writing team is working with graphic designer to develop 3 success stories, but unsure if we can fit them all in. We recognize there are a number of completed actions within the last 5 years that fit within multiple themes (example: New Haven Green infrastructure can also be used for the Sustainable and Resilient Communities Theme).
- Nikki Tachiki: We want to send the report to Mark Parker and Casey Personius as soon as the draft text is finished. Then, Mark and Casey will send it to NYSDEC and CTDEEP for a broader review. In terms of success stores, we are trying to be more inclusive with stories, but depends on graphic design artist and layout of report.
- Mark Tedesco: Agreed with Mark P., some success stories do cross themes and are welcomed. We need to recognize that in the text, but ultimately must work within the 4 themes. We will be working with LISS program staff and will share a draft once in a good working condition, and then we will pull the individual pieces together. Mark Parker and Casey Personius will share the draft with other agencies.

## 2020 CCMP Update – Nikki Tachiki

### Updates:

- Nikki Tachiki: Presented on the status of 2020-2024 updated IAs and emphasized the need to have tailored discussions around specific IAs which have been provided prior to the meeting. The point of this discussion is to achieve consensus as to how to move forward with specific IAs and create a final draft of IAs. She suggested everyone take another look at the drafted IAs as more than half of the actions have been revised based on feedback. Also provided a list of deletions and the reasoning behind it. Finally, she provided a specific list of IAs or topics, titled “July 23 Discussion Items MC Meeting,” for discussion to resolve conflicting interpretations and clarify proposed new IAs similar to existing IAs. (See PowerPoint presentation and associated documents for details of this section.)
- Mark Tedesco: We have a condensed schedule to complete the action update by the October Management Committee meeting. We will walk through each item individual, and review both specific feedback, questions, and determine how to move forward.
  - Discussion on WW-6
    - Nikki Tachiki: Read the background from the document, and asked NYSDEC to respond as they had commented on this IA to clarify the meaning on the word “evaluate”.
    - Sue Van Patten: We want to discuss what the word evaluate means. We want to make sure we recognize the fact the model has yet to be started and will require a lot of work. We like the fact the revision changes were there, but maybe the folks who put that together can explain what they envisioned for the second IA.

- Mark Tedesco: We wanted to emphasize two aspects: 1) Continue enhancing implementation of the TMDL through techniques to reduce nitrogen reductions to the Sound; and 2) Improve modeling tools and continue monitoring and research investments to evaluate progress in improving water quality, and ultimately achieve the goal of water quality standards. There may be better ways to phrase it.
- Phil Trowbridge: My read on this is that it is not really the idea of evaluating the TMDL in the next 5 years but going to conduct research and studies to contribute to an evaluation of the TMDL, particularly after the model is complete. Agreed that we need an IA to cover the significant investment in modeling and other studies to lead to an evaluation of a TMDL.
- Sue Van Patten: Agreed with changes seen on the document being edited.
- Mark Tedesco: Behind every 1-sentence action, we will develop a 1-page description of what the action means. Here we are clarifying that we are not saying to revise the TMDL by a certain date but to conduct the technical work to provide a basis for the evaluation, and will translate specifics as to how, when and if through direct discussions.
- Paul Stacey: The TMDL is not going to attain water quality standards and stated we would review it every 5 years and look at alternative approaches to meet standards. The purpose of a TMDL is to go with the best science available at the time and reevaluate it to see if it needs to be reconstructed to meet water quality standards.
- Mark Tedesco: We do need to revise the TMDL, and that is why we are making investments in additional technical work. We highlighted the short-comings of the science of that time and wanted to evaluate it based on the update to science.
- Gary Wikfors: Suggested “system response” be added to the description because some people wonder what technical work means.
- Mel Cote: Suggested to add “(better understand the system response)”, as we do not need the term technical work because we defined in front of sentence.
- Mark Tedesco: Addressed NYSDEC concerns with the IA.
- Proposed New IA for Nitrogen Loading Ecosystem Target
  - Nikki Tachiki: Read the background from the document, and asked CTDEEP to clarify interpretation as to which ecosystem target the new IA addresses, and if the action requires an implementation to be done by 2025.
  - Phil Trowbridge: LISO interpretation is correct to address the nitrogen loading ecosystem target. There were internal discussions as to how much implementation can be done, and the plan was for some implementation as possible, but full is unlikely to happen.
- Proposed New IA for the Impervious Cover Ecosystem Target
  - Holly Drinkuth: The comment from the CAC was intended to connect the IA to the ecosystem target. However, it does not have to be a separate IA.
  - Nikki Tachiki: Read the background from the document. We can either add the phrase the CAC proposed to the existing new IA above, or adopt this new IA, and therefore have an IA for the ecosystem target of Impervious Cover, and an IA for the ecosystem target of nitrogen loading (the previous proposed new IA).

- Paul Stacey: These are hard problems to manage and can't conceptualize how the two will be combined. Is the impervious cover IA enough to meet the nitrogen loading target? What is the loading target? Is it feasible to do this?
- Richard Friesner: Adding the language to the IA above is fine, but I echo Paul's comment about the 4% and how that relates to changes across the landscape over time.
- Jim Ammerman: These IAs address two different ecosystem targets. The first IA addresses the nonpoint source nitrogen loading, which is ½ of the nitrogen loading target, and has not been addressed to any significance. The second is important but also difficult; though it is related to the first, it is a different issue and separate ecosystem target. Recommends keeping the two IAs separate.
- Mark Tedesco: Agreed with Jim as they are two separate IAs that reference two independent ecosystem targets. Implementing practices that reduce impervious cover or continue implementing practices that reduce nonpoint nitrogen loading. There are examples of implementation to achieve both ecosystem targets. The question is are we doing enough to meet those targets, or do we need to accelerate or something differently?
- Holly Drinkuth: This conversation has been helpful. The first IA one seems clear, and the second IA is less clear as to what is needed. Maybe more studies are needed?
- Mark Parker: Is the 4% per year based on a 2010 baseline or from the previous year?
- Mark Tedesco: We define the pace needed on an annually basis to meet the target, but do not want to address it in an action as we provide a detailed description in the ecosystem target itself. These are clearly different actions and want to emphasize what we need to do in the next 5 years to continue adequate progress to achieve targets.
- Paul Stacey: It would be helpful to identify forceable mechanisms needed to achieve this IA.
- Mark Tedesco: That is the challenge and does not need to be achieved through regulatory approaches as we have multiple examples of how we are achieving this. However, is it enough?
- Proposed New IA
  - Nikki Tachiki: We have conflicting feedback on this new IA as it is similar to WW-13 and the proposed new IA for nitrogen loading ecosystem target.
  - Mark Tedesco: We think we have this new IA covered in WW-13.
  - Nancy Seligson: If we were to not include it in a new IA, and assume it is covered by WW-13 and/or the proposed new IA, would we then in the 1-page discussion include these specific points?
  - Mark Tedesco: Yes, we would detail the idea that we have initiated embayment specific plans (local watershed and subwatershed based). We can state that Connecticut has proposed new development plans in the next 5 years, and New York is addressing it through multiple subembayment watershed plans. Therefore, the 5 restoration plans are an underestimate, and we need to highlight activities on both coasts.

- Holly Drinkuth: The intent from CAC was to connect the IA to the nitrogen strategy. The next piece of collaborative is to engage and include the municipalities.
- Mark Tedesco: We do not need this as a new IA and can make the connection within the existing IAs to local watershed reduction targets, and inclusive to municipalities. We will provide this detail in the supporting information to the IA.
- Erik Bedan: CTDEEP perspective as to why to keep it in there – the language focuses on accepting new practices, rather than just developing plans, which includes new drone work for restoration.
- Mark Tedesco: Assessing habitat restoration, rather than making plans, may need to be an independent IA and need to better clarify the intent.
- Holly Drinkuth: Bill wrote the IA. Suggested the IA may need to be in Sound Science and Inclusive Management theme.
- Mark Tedesco: Agreed, will follow up directly with CTDEEP with the intent of the IA, and decide where it would be more appropriate to place IA in CCMP.
- Paul Stacey: My concern is the terminology “develop accepted practices” – isn’t that what we are doing now? We need to better determine the intent.
- Mark Parker: Phil (text message) said the intent of IA is a necessary first step to prepare restoration plans. It is emphasizing the need to develop accepted practices to assess the health of the embayments.
- Mark Tedesco: Will follow up with CTDEEP to develop this concept and language.
- WW-31
  - Nikki Tachiki: IA is similar to WW-13, propose new IA, and SM-13. Is there additional value in keeping nutrients in WW-31?
  - Mark Tedesco: Asked Sue, NYSDEC, to share her thoughts on this as nutrients covered in other IAs, but pathogens were not included in subwatershed management plans.
  - Sue Van Patten: Concerned that WW-13 is not suffice, but new IA might be. Want to emphasize that it was not just a pathogen source, it is also nutrients. Do not understand the value of taking “nutrients” out as it was not duplicative of other IAs.
  - Casey Personius: We took it out early in the assessment, and the idea was that nutrients were included in other IAs: WW-13, new IA, WW-22, WW-23, and WW-24.
  - Sue Van Patten: The TMDL does not specifically list all the different non-point sources, so if we are ultimately going to evaluate the TMDL we need to know where they are.
  - Mark Tedesco: There has been extensive work on Long Island to assess sources, and similar work in Connecticut (e.g., groundwater modeling with USGS and watershed modeling work to identify subwatershed sources). Agreed that the TMDL does not specify sources on a subwatershed scale; but there is work underway. Future Funds support projects to reduce nutrients in New Hampshire, Vermont, and Massachusetts. Is there any opposition to keeping the pathogens and nutrients in the IA? We can highlight relationships to other IAs in the 1-page supporting document.

- Casey Personius: Keeping it is fine and was an oversight to remove it.
- Paul Stacey: We all are in agreement to reduce nutrients – however, every square inch of the watershed is a nutrient source, and therefore there is more of a need to manage nutrients to an effective TMDL target, rather than eliminating nutrients entirely (as you would do for pathogens).
- Mark Tedesco: There are other IAs relating to assessing and developing plans for reduction targets, and we need to make that relation here in the supporting document.
- Jeff Barbaro: Wanted to make a comment about the terminology “linking models” – link is general term. We had some discussion internally and with CTDEEP about the developing groundwater model, in which want to somehow link HSPF with groundwater model, but it is difficult. However, we have tried to align subwatersheds, so the models complement each other.
- Mark Tedesco: The idea is to maximize the utility of the groundwater nutrient loading models, and if there is a better way to describe that, we should do that.
- Sustainable and Resilient Communities
  - Nikki Tachiki: Asked the group for thoughts on what type of role LISS be playing in assisting municipalities, as currently the LISS staff has the capacity to help state/regional efforts.
  - Mark Tedesco: We did provide support to Connecticut and New York Sea Grant to organize the Sustainable and Resilient Communities Working Group. It is important to identify who would take on this role, and how it will be implemented.
  - Sylvain De Guise: We have an inclusive and transparent process to define what priorities would be meaningful and significant. We want to make sure to not define priorities, before going through the process of identifying those priorities. Therefore, opposes identifying the role of assisting municipalities before identifying properties of the working group.
  - Nancy Seligson: Agreed with Sylvain - would like to see the plan the working group creates, and then define the priorities and IAs. Supports the first new IA incorporating environmental justice, as it is more important than ever.
  - Paul Stacey: Disappointed that the Sustainable and Resilient Communities IAs did not mention any sustainable or resilient ecosystems, as the actions all relate to human infrastructure and communities. In order to improve the Sound, we need to do it with restoration and preservation, rather than best management practices.
  - Holly Drinkuth: Supports the new IA to incorporate environmental justice within municipalities. Encourages to think of all listed IAs through the perspective of a municipalities applying to Future Funds, and how to help them figure out how their proposal will fit into CCMP.
  - Mark Tedesco: The environmental justice action is a unique and new IA. We have a lot of sustainable and resilient communities IAs, but also have a commitment to develop a more specific 5-year plan in 2021 and have an action that states developing a 5-year plan. Is it fine to have these overarching general IAs within this section in addition to the commitment of the 5-year plan?
  - Sylvain De Guise: Can we consider amending IAs a year from now based on working group?



- Mark Tedesco: Yes, we can have an IA stating that when the working group develops the 5-year plan, and is approved by the Management Conference, then the plan will automatically be incorporated into the CCMP. We want to further clarify our roles in the IAs. We make sure the action plan is incorporated into CCMP, and that we evaluate some other IAs to see if it necessary to include them or if they would better be severed by a more thoughtful 5-year plan from working group. However, the new IA at top of list is independent and should be kept within the list.
    - Becky Shuford: The ecosystem does include the human component (e.g., infrastructure), and emphasized that the new working group will include the ecosystem component in the discussion.
  - Sound Science and Inclusive Management
    - Nikki Tachiki: SM-18 and SM-19 are almost identical but address different audiences, and the level of description included is typically added to the technical supporting document. Should SM-18 and SM-19 remain separate, or incorporate them into technical supporting documents?
    - Nancy Seligson: Suggested to reduce the number of IAs, and the new IA could suffice to capture these ideas. Does not think it is necessary to have the SM-18 and SM-19 separate.
    - Holly Drinkuth: Agreed, but if we eliminate 18 and 19, then there should be some mention of audiences and tracking piece in the new IA.
    - Mark Tedesco: Agreed that there is value to eliminate IAs and can add the example of audiences within the IA (e.g., put in parentheses). In the technical supporting document, we can highlight the importance of metrics used to evaluate and track progress of meeting communication objectives.
    - Casey Personius: Agreed with reducing the number of IAs and condensing where possible. We want to keep in mind not to make actions complex that they become difficult to track.
    - Mark Tedesco: The current terminology of the IA allows us to track the progress and efficacy of the plan.
    - Mel Cote: Trying to condense IAs is a good idea, but I do not recommend prioritizing the Congressional Caucus over municipalities. Suggested to rephrase IA to include elected officials as it pertains to federal, state, and local, but still need to mention municipalities.
    - Mark Tedesco: Suggested to just give audience examples in IA and include detail in the technical supporting document.
    - Mark Parker: We can certainly build these ideas into the 1-page technical supporting documents, but we do have to be mindful of what we pack into IAs because then there will be a higher percentage of partially implemented actions.
  - Mark Tedesco: We will make these changes and send out a new version by August 1<sup>st</sup>, 2020. Please reach out if there is anything to incorporate in the next 5 years in order to ensure funding. Thank you, Nikki.

### Updates

- Mark Tedesco: For Future Funds, we received 89 proposals requesting more than \$9 million. This is triple the request of available funds, which is where we want to be. Also, the Long Island Sound Research Program has received 30 preproposals requesting more than the available funds.

- Sylvain De Guise: There are 36 preproposals requesting \$12 million, which is more than four times of the funds available.
- Mark Tedesco: There is a different emphasis in this RFP, in which asked applicants to make a connection to management application.
- Becky Shuford: Given the current environment, the Long Island Sound Research Conference, which would have been hosted next spring, will be postponed a year, but may add a virtual component for spring 2021.
- Mel Cote: Endorse the idea of virtual research conference. Secondly, last Friday, the U.S. Government Eastern District of New York Court issued the final decision on New York State's lawsuit against EPA over the designation of Eastern Long Island Sound Dredged Material Disposal Site. New York State has 60 days to appeal, in which we expect they will, but it is highly unlikely the decision will be overturned given the support.
- Jimena Perez-Viscasillas: Social Marketing Workshop has been moved to an online workshop September 21<sup>st</sup> – 23<sup>rd</sup> and will be held from 10am - 2:40pm. There will be capacity for 80 people.
  - Judy Preston: No fee associated with the workshop, but a commitment to attend all 3 days to Robert.
  - Audra Martin: Registration will be next week.
- Jim Ammerman: Conjoint STAC and CAC meeting in September will focus on environmental justice.

#### **Next Meeting & Adjournment – Mark Tedesco**

- Meeting was adjourned at 12:24 pm.