

Management Committee Meeting Notes
October 19th and 20th, 2022
Port Jefferson, NY



someAttendees:

Mark Tedesco, EPA LISO
Cayla Sullivan, EPA LISO
Esther Nelson, EPA LISO
Kristen Laccetti, EPA LISO
Nicole Tachiki, EPA LISO
Melissa Duvall, EPA LISO
Mel Coté, EPA R1
Leah O’Neill, EPA R1
Bessie Wright, EPA R1
Casey Abel, EPA R1
Ashley Desrosiers, EPA R1
Ben Lawton, EPA R2
John Came, EPA
Marty Chintala, EPA
Johnathan Hoffman, NYSDEP
Samarra Scantlebury, NYSDEC
Julia Socrates, NYSDEC
Mary Arnold, NYSDEC
Susan VanPatten, NYSDEC

Rick Balla, EPA R2
David Ansel, STS
Nancy Seligson, CAC/NY
Brian Thompson, CT DEEP
Kathleen Knight, CT DEEP
Harry Yamalis, CT DEEP
Christopher Bellucci, CT DEEP
Kevin O’Brien, CT DEEP
Kelly Streich, CT DEEP
Erik Bedan, CT DEEP
Richard Friesner, NEIWPCC
Jennifer Street, NYSDOS
Rebecca Shuford, NYSG
Elizabeth Hornstein, NYSG
Lillit Genovesi, NYSG
Sara Powell, NYSG
Jimena Perez-Viscasillas,
LISS/NYSG

Jim Ammerman, LISS/NEIWPCC
Robert Burg, LISS/NEIWPCC
Victoria O’Neill, NEIWPCC
Nancy Ferlow, USDA-NRCS
Jordan Bishop, NEIWPCC
Evelyn Powers, IEC
David Lipsky, NYCDEP
Danielle Alexander, NYCDEP
Kamazima Lwiza, SUNY SoMAS
Suzanne Paton, USFWS
Lynn Dwyer, NFWF
Alicia Tyson, CTSG
Jessica LeClair, CTSG
Sylvain DeGuise, CTSG
Jonathan Morrison, USGS
Sean Fisher, USGS

Introduction: Mark Tedesco welcomed everyone to the meeting at approximately 9:00am. He highlighted there are many things that will be discussed and outlined the objectives of the meeting, emphasizing FY23 investments, evaluate progress and future management ideas, and maximizing efficiency. He invited everyone in the room to introduce themselves.

Mark Tedesco: Welcomed Kamazima Lwiza, Jennifer Street and John Hoffman for representing their government entities. Thanked Marty and John for facilitating. Thanked Jordan for all his help in coordinating the movement.

Facilitator Remarks by Marty Chintala and John Came:

- Marty Chintala and John Came: Explained how timing for presentations will be conducted and meeting ground rules.

LISS Budget Trends & Program Investments – Leah O’Neill

- Leah O’Neill: Gave a refresher and overview of why we are here. Explained background of LISS and enabling authorizations. Gave an overview of structure and mentioned we stand out because of STAC and CAC. Budget has four distinct pots of money, which is important for budget conversations. BIL funds don’t currently need to match, other funds do but we can do aggregate match. CCMP can be updated every 5 years, last drafted in 2015 with previous budget that has now increased dramatically. Have base funding, going to ongoing programs, and supplemental funding, going to newer proposed work. Supplemental covers infrastructure funds.
 - Mel Cote: Asked if supplemental funding can be moved into base with the increase in funding.
 - Leah O’Neill: Replied yes. Explained if you have a supplemental request, you will mark if it has base funding implications. Gave an example. Reiterated that a dramatic increase in funding allows supplemental projects to move to base.

- Leah O’Neill: Explained Final FY22 budget handout. Covers both CWA 119 and 320 funds. Many new initiatives as well as expanding existing programs. New investments since 2019 that stand out are environmental justice and SRC work group. Able to waive match requirements for BIL awards so we were able to fund additional work through traditional funds thanks to overmatch. Expanded monitoring to include new embayments. High priority for land acquisition for habitat restoration and protection. Explained FY22 BIL funding. Limited grantees receiving these funds due to uncertainty surrounding reporting requirements. Important to integrate environmental justice into program as well as improve infrastructure. Reviewed meeting objectives and set up questions for each participant to keep in mind for the rest of the meeting.
 - Sylvain DeGuise: Asked if Inflation Reduction Act funding will trickle to LIS.
 - Leah O’Neill: Responded we don’t know yet.
 - Brian Thompson: Added that the funds may not be directly coming to LISS program, but NOAA has a good deal of money for habitat restoration work.
 - Leah O’Neill: Reiterated that partners could get funds for LIS projects.
 - Nancy Seligson: Reminded everyone that LISS is a partnership that is complicated as we work with many state and federal governments as well as non-profits etc. and it is important to retool what we are doing as more and more people become involved.
 - Leah O’Neill: Added that LISS straddles multiple programs and is the only NEP led by EPA so we need to be a collaborative program.
 - Jim Ammerman: Had enhancement budget proposal that went through multiple partners but got complaints from outside partners. Asked what the procedure will be for this year.
 - Leah O’Neill: Responded that we are a non-competitive program so reviewing enhancement proposals became too burdensome. Unable to take on new partners due to increase in funds but no increase in staff. Last year more of a transition year. Have Futures fund and CIF that are competitive. Work in progress and hopeful we can be more inclusive.
 - Bessie Wright: Added that we have a competitive research pot.
 - Richard Friesner: Mentioned the importance to vocalize support for increase in funding and opportunity.
 - Robert Burg: Added to make sure we are accountable to the public and keep up with outreach with increase in funding.
 - Nancy Seligson: Have worked hard towards coordinating. Asked if we are looking for specific things to improve the work group systems.
 - Leah O’Neill: Responded that the next two sections are all about work groups.
 - Sylvain DeGuise: Asked if we have the right players at the table. For example, NOAA NER in CT that could be helpful.
 - Leah O’Neill: Added that it is great to reevaluate regularly to not only assess who is on MC committee but also work groups.
 - Mel Cote: Added that NERRs work with NEPs in other programs.
 - Mark Tedesco: Added it is a great opportunity that we want to work toward.
 - Esther Nelson: Mentioned there were retirements recently and to think about who replacements in work groups could be.
 - Rick Balla: Mentioned the low funding and staff a few years ago but mentioned we have many more staff to provide support needed to run program now.

- Leah O’Neill: Added we are comparably staffed compared to other national programs. We would like to have our partners have an EPA staff member to build connections with.
- Becky Shuford: Asked how communications plan recommendations play into budget.
 - Cayla Sullivan: Responded that it will be reviewed in next section.
 - Leah O’Neill: Mentioned the boat slip can be used so people/groups can follow up on MC committee choices.

Topic 1A. Work Group Priorities and Needs – Cayla Sullivan, Esther Nelson, Kelly Streich, Vicky O’Neill

- Cayla Sullivan, Kelly Streich, Vick O’Neill, Casey Abel, Esther Nelson: Explained work group priorities and needs for each work group. Showed progress to date for ecosystem targets and themes, what is being met, what targets are behind schedule and how to move those targets towards 2035 goal. Outlined all the behind schedule and missing data ecosystem targets (ETs). Gave an overview of how some of these ETs are being addressed. (See presentation)
 - Samarra Scantlebury: Mentioned public access and approved shellfish behind but working on getting info from other agencies so it is in process and could turn out to be meeting or exceeding targets.
 - Esther Nelson: Important point that there are many balls in the court.

Stretch Break at 10:40am

Topic 1A: Facilitated Discussion

Discussion Question 1: Can the current workgroup structure improve in efficiency? If so, how?

Discussion Question 2: How can we further integrate science needs, climate adaptation and resilience, EJ and COE efforts across work group topics, activities, and outcomes?

- Dave Lipsky: Mentioned using metric of behind schedule doesn’t describe where we are at on the topic. It makes it hard to determine priorities.
 - Cayla Sullivan: Responded that it is difficult to calculate some targets but on LISS website there is raw data showing what percentage to target we are at.
 - Mark Tedesco: Mentioned Chesapeake Bay has ideas about non-point source target due to population increase while we don’t, so we do not have enough detail to explain the whole story regarding non-point source pollution.
- Suzanne Patton: Explained the stewardship and habitat restoration WG were two different workgroups previously and suggested considering breaking them up again due to increased resources.
- Sylvain DeGuise: Commented he did not see the contribution of research projects and that it might be valuable to better account for those more towards targets.
- Becky Shuford: Mentioned that there is some great Sound Science theme work but that it could be better communicated to broader audience. Synthesizing and communicating the work (and its relevance) would be beneficial.
- Suzanne Patton: Mentioned we update targets over time and asked if everyone thinks targets are reasonable.
 - Kamazima Lwiza: Responded that targets must be well defined. For example, the impervious surface target is a bit complicated.
- Becky Shuford: Asked for clarity about presentation and FY23 budget discussion.
- Sylvain DeGuise: Asked if we are measuring the right things. For example, public access points hard to increase but attendance could be going up.
- Marty Chintala: Redirected the discussion and asked if we should be focusing on areas that are behind schedule for FY23.

- Rick Balla: Responded that it is worth looking at but can't fully shift all priorities or others will fall behind.
- Becky Shuford: Responded we should be considering why they are behind and if we are measuring the right things.
- Bessie Wright: Asked what targets are close to the finish line that we could complete if we push a little further.
- Brian Thompson: Responded to question of behind schedule priorities – need to get a better handle on the full scope of everything to know what will be helpful to meet those goals. Many new funding opportunities to help move these priorities along.
 - Kate Knight: Mentioned climate change and new priorities will be tied into all the existing priorities.
- Mark Tedesco: Mentioned that if a target is behind schedule, it doesn't mean we don't have plans in place to address catching up. Work plans grapple with this issue which we are trying to confirm and recommend how we can fill that gap.
- Esther Nelson: Asked if we only count projects funded by EPA and how do we count other projects and track them.
 - Sue Van Patton: Responded tracking doesn't exist outside of LISS funding and we need to integrate and build a tool that will make that available.
- Nancy Seligson: Mentioned that aside from behind schedule targets we have obligations to fund EJ and SRC projects but are not listed as behind schedule.
 - Jim Ammerman: Responded that indicators group meets monthly only looks at ecosystem targets not funding, etc.
 - Bessie Wright: Mentioned for EJ there are no indicators so not part of this report out. Only just begun needs assessment so no baseline to build target. But should be ready for next **update?**
- Vicky O'Neill: Mentioned that habitat restoration tracking is done using a database and most projects not federally funded.
- Leah O'Neill: Pointed out a possible crossover in terminology. Explained that talking about ecosystem targets (ETs) are only related to the environment but we do track implementation actions but we can't ask people to report on what we don't fund. NEPs required to report on certain targets for habitat that includes outside federally funded projects. Balancing reporting burden with metrics may shift in the future.
- Suzanne Patton: Followed up on tracking ETs – when these were established is this what EPA was going to bring to the table or was everyone going to play a role with their funding?
 - Vicky O'Neill: Mentioned they wanted to count everyone's funding for habitat tracking.
- Alicia Tyson: Asked where efforts by organizations to focus on doing socio-economic projects not funded through EPA are being recorded or tracked.
- Robert Burg: Mentioned if we fulfilled ETs we would fulfill our vision. Tracking them is a daunting task for some. Could start with supporting ETs.
- Harry Yamalis: Explained that targets were created by extracting the average of the previous 5 years and it was a best guess.
- Elizabeth Hornstein: Commented on SRC and that impervious surface targets should be a priority and something other workgroups could be working on. Work is happening to help address it and asked how that is being tracked.
 - Kate Knight: Responded that there was a land cover analysis project launched in FY22 to make sure metrics will be comparable for past and future as well as to update metrics and explore new metrics or supporting indicators.

- Robert Burg: Mentioned this is difficult and we don't currently have data available for this after 2015.
- Kate Knight: Commented that this new national tool will help us update that data and relieve that burden and hopefully see great progress.
- Cayla Sullivan: Explained the presenting group had limited time to talk about all metrics so she could send out forms to help everyone get a better grasp and decide on whether to focus on behind or on track.
 - Esther Nelson: Emphasized that the budget has a lot of base awards on track, so they are not suggesting we cut that but looking to spend where we are not currently spending.
- Marty Chintala: Reminded everyone to think about how to go forward and make these decisions.
 - Leah O'Neill: Explained we don't need to prioritize right now but need to get ideas and proposals then prioritization would happen in April meeting.
 - Kamazima: Reiterated we don't have enough information to make informed decision on how to prioritize yet. Need to know why these targets are behind.
- Lynn Dwyer: Mentioned that how to address priority needs hasn't been discussed.
 - Marty Chintala: Agreed and asked if the MC meeting have a process for how to do this.
 - Bessie Wright: Asked if there are ideas for actions that should be funded based on what we are missing.
 - Susan Van Patten: Responded that we should get a document with work group title and what is going good/behind schedule to get a sense of where we are and can marry that with proposals to help prioritize to see the whole picture.
 - Cayla Sullivan: Reiterated that the document she will put together will show what is behind schedule and why then we can follow Sue's idea and that would be effective.
 - Sylvain DeGuise: Mentioned that it is hard to assess contributions and might be of value in going back to workgroups to reshape work plan in view of behind schedule targets to close the loop and have WGs give suggestions.
 - John Hoffman: Mentioned MC is being asked to prioritize big buckets. WGs can prioritize their own buckets and help organize proposals based on best value.
- Marty Chintala: Suggested WGs do their work plan and prioritize themselves and come back to MC.
 - Becky Shuford: Asked if these projects are in addition to base funding or will they be worked into base funding.
 - Mark Tedesco: Responded both. Gave example: engagement work plan identified increase staff for funding and contractual support for website design. If those staff were long term that would be base. Other things mentioned in work plan to support ETs with new staff that might not fit directly into specific ETs but still important to the mission.
 - Chris Bellucci: Responded yes and liked Sylvain's idea of reshaping workplans. Mentioned Harry's group feels that some metrics are good but not all and the question for prioritization might be too early.
 - Someone commented that it's more challenging to make progress on certain ETs – how can WGs be catalysts for those more difficult targets.
 - Bessie Wright: Mentioned only one ET focuses on EJ and we should think about how to expand our targets.
 - Suzanne Patton: Stated that interconnectivity in WGs should be used here if we kick back to WGs for priorities.
 - Marty Chintala: Asked Cayla if her document would address interconnectivity.

- Cayla Sullivan: Stated that could be included but not sure how to highlight that.
- Esther Nelson: Mentioned to consider how long this will take and people's schedule.
- Marty Chintala: Asked what the process should be.
 - Sylvain DeGuise: Mentioned not rewriting proposals.
 - Mark Tedesco: Commented there has been useful discussion. Suggested summarizing and reorganizing information from WGs based on interpretation and funding and put into context of ETs. That could then use that to go to a partner or entity to develop a proposal based on what is pulled out of these work plans. So, more synthesis of WGs work plans and build off that initially.
 - Harry Yamalis: Mentioned we prioritize by opportunity, can't do a project without a project manager.
 - Nancy Seligson: Commented that this meeting will help to improve the process along with the next presentation. Questioned how to improve efficacy of WGs.

Topic 1B. Work Group Functions, Membership, and Coordination - Cayla Sullivan, Esther Nelson, Kelly Streich, Vicky O'Neill

- Esther Nelson and Vicky O'Neill: Presented on work group functions, membership, and coordination. Outlined changes in workgroups since 2015 and the cross-cutting principals that are shared across all work groups. Identified major concerns about work groups such as overlapping missions and priorities, purpose of the work groups and alignment of priorities. (See presentation)

Topic 1B: Facilitated Discussion

Discussion Questions: See Topic 1A.

- Marty Chintala: Asked if the current work group(WG) structure can be effective.
 - Nancy Seligson: Responded yes. Commented that this discussion is important to make everything flow better. Groups are internal to EPA but still important to the public.
- Marty Chintala: Asked what it would take to be efficient.
 - Kevin O'Brien: Gave two suggestions: Integrating WGs with each other where there is overlap and making sure WG leadership gets together to address issues.
 - Julia Socrates: Commented that overlap is not necessarily redundancy, but joint meeting can bring together different point of views.
 - Lynn Dwyer: Commented that the synopsis of WG plans was very helpful and informative.
 - Jon Hoffman: Asked if people on multiple WGs are giving feedback from other groups talking about the same issues.
 - Samarra Scantlebury: Responded that climate change sentinel monitoring group is trying to have a representative from each other work group.
 - Kelly Streich: Mentioned that discussion does carry over.
 - Jordan Bishop: Mentioned he sits on multiple WGs and some groups are working on things more immediate to their targets.
 - Esther Nelson: Commented that there is not a formal or standard way to report to each other and more of an expectation could be helpful.
 - Jim Ammerman: Commented that a joint WG meeting has been done once that he knows of.
 - Bessie Wright: Mentioned the EJ WG has been working on meeting all other WGs and it has been difficult since WGs only meet 4 times a year. Said it is important to coordinate but there is a downside to so many meetings.
 - Leah O'Neill: Mentioned the implementation team meetings to prepare MC meeting agenda as well as report out from WG chairs and that regular LIS core team meetings are an opportunity for cross pollination. Commented that historically there were WG updates at MC meetings but lots of information to give with limited time.

- Sue Van Patton: Mentioned every WG started off with a clear goal, role for members and expectations of members in their role. Explained that it is expected that you should spread the message beyond the work group.
 - Marty Chintala: Asked if this is this currently being done.
- Kate Knight: Suggested that co-chairs could plan half a year at time which allows time to set up joint meetings.
- Nancy Seligson: Mentioned CAC wanted to directly link WGs workplans to ecosystem targets (ETs) and choose one topic the WG could provide external communication on.
- Evelyn Powers: Suggested sharing agendas with WG co-chairs to see if there are agenda items that are relevant to other WGs. Mentioned agendas should have set structure and action items for efficiency.
- Robert Burg: Suggested asking other estuary programs how they handle work groups.
- Chris Bellucci: Suggested the possibility of hiring an outside group to link the WGs and get an independent viewpoint.
- Bessie Wright: Mentioned that cross cutting themes are not necessarily tied to indicators.
 - Lillit Genovesi: Suggested having a template of all work groups available to everyone where work groups state what they are discussing.
 - Kate Knight: Added this could be similar to how we communicate presentations.
 - Nancy Seligson: Mentioned the CAC recommended specific actions in WG plans that related to cross cutting themes.
- Samarra Scantlebury: Asked if someone to coordinate WGs could be added to the communications plan.
 - Richard Friesner: Mentioned this conversation could come up again in rebranding and how we explain what we do to people.
- Mary Arnold: Commented that there is too much variance in operation and engagement in WGs for structured engagement right now. Suggested reassessing how WGs operate then move towards more structure.
- Bessie Wright: Is work group term for all these groups the right way to describe all of them? Suggested renaming certain groups that don't fit the definition of WG and can't fit into a structured agenda and have different templates for the different buckets that people fit into.
- Mark Tedesco: Mentioned the governance document does not enforce structure and leaves work groups to be flexible.
- Lillit Genovesi: Suggested the idea of templates can be optional and non-formal but as a means of communication.
- Sylvian DeGuise: Stated a template to have a template not useful.
- Evelyn Powers: Mentioned that agendas can have flexibility, but they need to have an element of how to identify outcomes.
- Jim Ammerman: Commented the WG agenda is usually short but will have no problem making it more formal. Mentioned they schedule meetings based on need but agreed that communication among groups can approve.
- Kate Knight: Mentioned the agenda format isn't a necessary format but suggested that everyone talks about the needs followed by open forum for WG meetings.
- Becky Shuford: Asked if there is a way to have check ins about what everyone is doing. Pointed out that some of this information is being collected it just needs to be shared. Mentioned it is still the onus on WGs to look at what other groups are doing.

- Mark Tedesco: Commented that we want to engage WGs on outcomes and budget so WGs can bring proposals about how to identify what needs to be done. Mentioned there are multiple ways to get to the ultimate proposal but need WGs to help forge that path.
 - Nancy Seligson: Suggested having WGs translate their work into what needs to be done next and what needs action.
 - Mark Tedesco: Responded that's what we ask them to do and by and large they do that.
 - Robert Burg: Mentioned WGs do sometimes coordinate and also realize there is a gap, so it is happening.
 - Richard Friesner: Mentioned the nitrogen coordination WG identified bio extraction as important to multiple WGs. Explained they decided that it is not their strength so another WG could be responsible for it.
- Nikki Tachiki: Mentioned a lot of WG work plans identified implementation actions that don't always directly lead into an ET. Explained that you may not see movement in ETs but progress is being made on implementation actions (IAs) and maybe more emphasis is needed on metrics for ETs.
- Bessie Wright: Mentioned IAs are what we focus on now and using IAs will move towards ETs and play a role in each ET. Suggested focusing on achievable to measure vs too big to measure.
 - Nikki Tachiki: Agreed and mentioned for the CCMP the ETs are clearly defined and IAs were not all written to feed into those ETs.
- Marty Chintala: Asked how we integrate EJ, science needs, climate adaptation, etc.
 - Bessie Wright: Stated the EJ WG is trying to integrate EJ into all workgroups, but it is new territory and they are experimenting to see how it works.
 - Mark Tedesco: Explained how N coordination WG highlighted bioextraction and if no WG advocated for that it may not have moved forward. Added that it is important for a WG to highlight something important to our bigger goals even if they are not the lead on it. Added that convergence on data management synthesis needs additional work.
 - Mary Arnold: Mentioned there are multiple IAs for ETs which could be in line for more than one WG and all WGs based work plans on IAs.
 - David Lipsky: Asked if there should be a combining of groups to get a larger science needs group that deals with broad topic.
 - Elizabeth Hornstein: Mentioned the habitat work plan calls out where they will work with the SRC team and work plans make a good place to call out where groups will coordinate.
 - Cayla Sullivan: Mentioned we could connect IAs to ETs but we track those statuses differently. Explained that ETs use secondary data sources but use primary data for IAs. Mentioned a long-term thought – tracking ETs through links to IAs more effectively and having that true connection.
 - Kate Knight: Responded that indicators review team wants to link IAs to ETs more clearly.
 - Leah O'Neill: Mentioned some WGs are newer and have had staff changes so this discussion will help WGs grow in their own way. Shared wrap up of conversation.
 - Rick Balla: Mentioned the influx of funding has made it more complicated.
 - Robert Burg: Commented that as workplans get more complicated we need to think about what this means for staff.

Topic 2: Data Management - James Ammerman, Melissa Duvall, Shawn Fisher

- Melissa Duvall and Jim Ammerman: Discussed water quality data collection, storage, and public access. Outlined who is collecting water quality data and how the data is not stored in public access areas. Some data stored in the water quality portal is not updated. Explained how data management relates to priorities from different work groups. Most work groups have data management as a priority all in their own way.
- Shawn Fisher: Explained the USGS data clearinghouse project and how it will take the form of an online mapper but will not be serving as a database.

Topic 2: Facilitated Discussion

Discussion Question 1: Are there other issues related to data management that have not been addressed?

Discussion Question 2: Are there data issues clearinghouse should address if there is additional funding?

- Samarra Scantlebury: Asked who will oversee take aways from presentation.
 - Jim Ammerman: Responded EPA for everything but the USGS clearinghouse project.
- Bessie Wright: Asked if only data from EPA funded projects is currently used.
 - Jim Ammerman: Responded yes.
 - Melissa Duvall: Added Shawn could expand out to other public databases.
 - Bessie Wright: Asked if other data from the upper watershed could be incorporated.
 - Shawn Fisher: Responded yes. Added that any info that can be provided can be added and the goal is for as much info as possible.
 - Jim: Also need to include FF and research projects.
 - Sue VanPatten: Asked if LISS will provide a list of appropriate places to put data.
 - Melissa Duvall: Replied that they prioritize the water quality portal but data could be put elsewhere if it can't be stored there.
 - Sue VanPatten: Mentioned static data could be eliminated.
 - Shawn Fisher: Responded that would be beneficial but it might not be possible due to how it is stored.
- Kamazima Lwiza: Asked why we don't have a database for LISS data and models.
 - Shawn Fisher: Mentioned the map would give information about where you can find models but not displaying those results or data.
- Lynn Dwyer: Asked what the start date is for the data and what level of QA/QC will be implemented.
 - Shawn Fisher: Responded any data you have can be used and there will be three levels of QC for the data then you determine if you want to use that data.
 - Kamazima Lwiza: Mentioned colleagues who have retired and people have obtained their data. Asked where that data should go.
 - Melissa Duvall: Responded that goes back to the water quality portal. Mentioned an issue with having a set database is that it would increase requirements for the data.
 - Kelly Streich: Asked where the clearing house will be hosted.
 - Shawn Fisher: Responded that USGS has a contract with Amazon.
 - Kate Knight: Asked if models will be stored on this tool.
 - Melissa Duvall: Responded no but it will provide info on where to find model.
 - Kate Knight: Asked what the data filtering process looks like and how unrelated projects are handled.

- Shawn Fisher: Responded they will just show the model itself and not any data that is part of the model. Mentioned they will meet with stakeholders and groups to help determine types of data and attributes that will be included.
- Ben Lawton: Mentioned sharing methods of data validation and models could be useful.
- Jon Morrison: Added that there are too many different types of data for one database and should put focus on making sure historical data is saved and passed on.
- Rick Balla: Asked how this could overlap with EJ and small community groups collecting data.
 - Shawn Fisher: Responded that any organization that collects relevant data can be added to this tool.
 - Jim Ammerman: Added that the Quikdrops tool from Save the Sound would be applicable to that data.
- Becky Shuford: Suggested this group should think about finding a central database.
 - Jim Ammerman: Commented that it is up to the MC committee and has been historically pushed back on.
- Chris Bellucci: Asked if the data will be chosen from the WQP based on QA. Also asked if we are ready to require projects funded by LISS in the WQP.
 - Shawn Fisher: Responded to first question with a yes.
 - Mark Tedesco: Stated all data that can go into the portal must go into the portal and we need to work to make sure that happens.
- David Lipsky: Mentioned he hopes the mapping tool contains data from NYC harbor program, etc.
 - Shawn Fisher: Responded it could be incorporated but it is up to the group.
- David Lipsky: Mentioned a system wide model will store input and output data on github and asked if we should have a storage area that has already been QC'd?
- Bessie Wright: Stated in response to incorporating EJ they can work with a new organization to help them learn what they need to do to get data into system.
- Sue VanPatten: Asked what hole we are filling by having a database.
 - Becky Shuford: Responded it allows people to have direct access to data.
 - Melissa Duvall: Commented that this data will be dynamically linked to the data sets that the data was taken from.
- Lynn Dwyer: Mentioned pulling from multiple datasets raises concerns about secondary use of data and additional funds will be needed to meet some requirements.
- Kate Knight: Mentioned API takes the burden off data entry and streamline to make it available.
- Kamazima Lwiza: Mentioned he wants to capture as many variables as possible.
- Mark Tedesco: Stated this will be a long ongoing discussion and additional funds will be needed. Added it will be a commitment, and this is just a start.

Topic 3: Communication, Outreach, and Education Plan - Robert Burg, Ashley Desrosiers, Casey Abel

- Robert Burg: Talked about needs of outreach team to implement CCMP goals. Went through the COE plan highlights. Mentioned six common observations among estuary programs, three of which were related to communications and three others were related to partnership building. Outlined communications capacity and resources. Went through priorities for 2023-2024. Mentioned the possibility of rebranding the Long Island Sound Study and went through pros and cons of rebranding.

Topic 3: Facilitated Discussion**Discussion Focus: Deployment of current capacity and resources, additional resources needed and rebranding considerations and steps.**

- Nancy Seligson: Stated the CAC fully supports everything presented today needed to help communications and is one of their top priorities.
- Marty Chintala: Stated the first discussion focus revolves around increased staffing.
- Sue VanPatten: Clarified if they are asking for two more staff.
 - Robert Burg: Responded yes.
- Kate Knight: Asked if there have been any thoughts on improving access regarding multiple languages.
 - Robert Burg: Replied he would like more stories done in diverse communities.
- Becky Shuford: Mentioned her support for building out communications capacity.
- Sylvain DeGuise: Asked if the two new science communication positions will work on consistent messaging.
 - Robert Burg: Responded these positions could help sea grant as well and can coordinate.
 - Sylvain DeGuise: Stated education efforts haven't grown enough in the past few years.
 - Robert Burg: Responded there are lots of opportunities for collaboration.
- Erik Bedan: Commented he fully supports increasing web presence and mentioned weaving in use of QR codes.
- Richard Friesner: Suggested having a professional come in and teach an elevator speech about LISS.
- Suzanne Patton: Asked if there is there an education coordination work group.
 - Robert Burg: Replied yes, to an extent.
 - Jimena Perez-Viscasillas: Mentioned they are expanding to bring kids from schools to the sound.
 - Alicia Tyson: Mentioned other associations that already exist can provide context and expand our reach to marginalized communities.
 - Becky Shuford: Suggested education outreach coordinators focus on their duties while new communications staff take over some of what they've been doing.
 - Kate: Asked if we can leverage communication funds off future funds money.
 - Robert Burg: Responded that could be an option.
 - Kate Knight: Suggested it could be a new metric or see what metric it fits into it.
 - Lynn Dwyer: Mentioned marine debris keeps coming up within communities and we should focus on that. Suggested adding metrics and explaining them to FF.
- Marty Chintala: Stated the discussion is moving on to rebranding idea.
 - Samarra Scantlebury: Asked if we would move away from paper materials.
 - Robert Burg: Replied shorter pieces would be on paper to direct to the website and the website will hold things no longer on paper.
 - Sylvain DeGuise: Asked what we will be rebranding to.
 - Robert Burg: Responded we will present what we are already doing in a better way.
 - Richard Friesner: Suggested hiring someone who does this for a living to ask around to hear what people think LISS is.
 - Jordan Bishop: Mentioned it is important to see how people who don't know who we are think of LISS when thinking about what we want to rebrand to, our logo, and how it will translate to other people.
 - Bessie Wright: Asked if we are wanting to rebrand or if we want to explore rebrandin.g
 - Robert Burg: Replied we are committing to getting a consultant and explore rebranding.
 - Richard Friesner: Explained we would hire an expert to come up with options and then decided yes or no.

- Suzanne Patton: Suggested not investing money if the room is against rebranding. Commented it is less about the name and more about the messaging, but the name is important.
- Mary Arnold: Asked how long the process would be and how long until we hear about feasibility.
 - Richard Friesner: Responded about a year to commit the money then a year for feasibility, so around an 18-month project.
- Sylvain DeGuise: Asked if it is a brand or identity issue versus a communication issue.
- Jim Ammerman: Asked NEWPICC to describe their rebranding process.
 - Richard Friesner: Explained their board decided to rebrand then hired a consultant. Ideas were presented to the board then voted on.
 - Jordan Bishop: Mentioned he started after the rebranding and helped him know his role better.
- Mel Cote: Asked if dropping 'study' from the name was discussed during the first CCMP. Mentioned spending money to rebrand might not be the best use of funds as a government entity.
 - Robert Burg: Mentioned it is not just about the name.
- Mark Tedesco: Mentioned 2025 is an update to CCMP and anything changed should be done in time for that.
- Suzanne Patton: Echoed Sylvain about what rebranding is. Asked if it is a communication issue that could be addressed by new communication staff.
- Harry Yamalis: Echoed Mel about changing name. Suggested it should still have LIS in name.
- Jimena Perez-Viscasillas: Mentioned interactions with the public in which the name makes people think we are a study.
- Sue VanPatten: Explained the state went through with rebranding and everything you do is included and linked all to each other. Explained we would have to wait until Oct '23 to start rebranding so we would maybe done by 2025. Asked if we have unallocated funds to use before then.
 - Leah O'Neill: Responded yes, there are some funds.
- Vicky O'Neill: Mentioned rebranding is everything from an elevator speech to the name. Reiterated what Jimena said about the current name.
 - Robert Burg: Responded yes, and it will help how we communicate with our partners.
- Kate Knight: Asked what the other pieces of rebranding are besides a logo, name and elevator pitch.
 - Robert Burg: Responded adding awareness of who we are or what we do.
 - Richard Friesner: Explained NEWPICC combined a strategic plan with rebranding that clearly articulates who they are and what they do.
- Lynn Dwyer: Asked what the first step is.
 - Mark Tedesco: Stated we have 26 months to rebrand. Asked if there is a quick, simple fix that could be implemented in that time.
 - Robert Burg: Responded we would have to reach out to a consultant and compete this.
- Jon Morrison: Asked if we are conflating the name and logo change with the message.
- Alicia Tyson: Mentioned the complex aspects and importance of being up to date with the disability act.

Wrap Up

- Mark Tedesco: Thanked everyone for attention and discussion.
- Meeting was adjourned at 5:30pm.

Day 2

Introduction: Marty welcomed everyone to day two of the meeting. She gave a high-level summary of day one. Work group 1A presentation did not answer to the bigger question but had lots of discussion. Work group 1B discussion surrounded whether there should be more integration and how to do so such as summaries and identifying members in multiple groups. Discussion on ETs vs IAs. Data management group discussion discussed accessibility, standard database for everyone, etc. Topic 3 had overwhelming support for additional staff, there was discussion about rebranding and what needs to be done and if it is a naming vs communication issue. Introduced the environmental justice, SRC and governance presentations. Pointed out boat slip discussion items that are relevant for this day.

Topic 4: Environmental Justice – Nicole Tachiki, Bessie Wright, Jimena Perez Viscasillas

Nicole Tachiki, Bessie Wright, Jimena Perez Viscasillas: Presented on the Environmental Justice Work Group updates where they provided an overview about the work group (that was formalized by the Management Committee in October 2022), the developed 5-year work plan, and updates on initiatives.

1. Engagement starting with 3-5 areas per state – community engagement professionals continue meeting to coordinate and ID opportunities for partnership. The next task is the EJ Needs Assessment which was funded in FY2021. Selected contractor by October/November. The contractor will fill in technical gaps, but LISS staff will work closely and ensure implementation.
2. Internal Assessment – ongoing task to improve shared reality of what EJ means. The next step is to fund in FY23 an internal assessment to bring in trainings to properly address. Paperwork reduction act has slowed down progress. But identified funding to bring in basic DEIJ trainings
3. LIS Community Impact Fund – funding vehicle to address communities with EJ concerns. Will serve as a pass through and technical program. In the middle of the selection phase and awaiting final award.
4. Conversations with LISS WGs and Committees (EJ Lens Exploration) – aiming to finish initial conversations by FY23. Propose to have a meeting with the Management Committee in Summer 2023.

They then went into the FY2023 Work Plan and Priorities. Priorities include EJ engagement coordination group, EJ needs assessment, CIF, internal assessment, and continue WG conversations and support work group EJ initiatives. Funding priorities for FY23 include list actionable goals and steps to integrate EJ into other FY work plans, DEIJA training funds, and support initiatives and projects that increase accessibility to information.

Kristen Laccetti and Ashely Desrosiers: Presented on the Justice40 assessment and required reporting. Justice40 is a framework for assessing and reporting out on the existing EJ work. Justice40 Initiative EO with goal to have 40% of benefits from federal funds flow to “disadvantaged communities”. The equity strategy is to be developed to implement Justice40 in which will include feedback from the workgroups. Resources to create disadvantaged community definition – NEP suggested definition, state definitions, existing LISS mapping to identify target areas. SDI is not the best for LISS watershed and adaptation still missed places; but state definitions captured all areas and additional areas to explore. Areas for future work: 1) accounting for downstream projects, 2) Exploring the upper watershed and 3) Capturing communities not defined by census data. Next steps are to calculate baseline funding going to disadvantaged communities and prepare equity strategy.

Topic 4: Facilitated Discussion

Discussion Question 1: In what ways can LISS increase the percentage of BIL funds supporting Justice40 goals?

- Sylvain DeGuise: Mentioned his concern about identifying tangible benefits in underserved communities – communities are not necessarily lines on the maps (i.e., fishing communities). In a previous exercise looked at subsistence fishing in which are not necessarily in EJ-defined communities.
 - Bessie Wright: Tried to address this gap in the EJ definition – cannot base it on census data.
 - Nikki Tachiki: Added this is in response to the Justice40 requirements, but not trying to let it drive the WG. Mentioned other activities will address this gap.
 - Jimena Perez-Vascasillas: Mentioned mapping was just diving in, but it will require ground-truthing.
- Jon Hoffman: Suggested this should be factored into the WG Work Plans and therefore projects. Explained this can be factored into priorities like shoreline access and can be factored into the prioritization system.
- Sue Van Patten: Mentioned DEC is getting BIL funding and suggested that DEC and EPA can connect so that we do not duplicate efforts.
- Kate Knight: Mentioned CIRCA is working to re-evaluate EJ definitions and assessment and there will be an opportunity to revise definitions annually to incorporate lessons learned from ongoing projects.
- Becky Shuford: Suggested that lessons learned should move up the chain so they are also aware of gaps that are watershed specific.
- Lynn Dwyer: Asked about NYS definitions and about the pass-through funding of CIF and required reporting.
 - Kristen Laccetti: Replied NYS definition is on DEC’s website.
 - Bessie Wright: Mentioned recipient of the program do the best they can to relieve the admin burden on subrecipients.
- Nancy Seligson: Suggested having regular communications with SRC staff and CAC members as they are working in communities and know local municipalities.
- Suzanne Patton: Commented the habitat group struggles a lot with the tradeoff between restoration opportunities and underserved communities and asked how we identify the messaging.
- Dave Lipsky: Mentioned NYC has its own EJ definition and report coming out at the end of the year. Explained the definition should be more community-based as a census block could be a street and therefore not a community.
- Mark Tedesco: Commented this is a reporting structure, not a defining decision-making structure and it is to track if we are hitting that 40 percent goal. Explained we want the decision-making process to help people and we will defend results in reporting, but we don’t want to become subservient to a target that drives bad decisions.
 - Bessie Wright: Explained that the definition has enough flexibility to work with CT and NY states to really address gaps.
- Samarra Scantlebury: Mentioned DEC acquired sites and can make those sites into public access sites; but we need more guidance from BIL as to what we can do with those sites.
- Alicia Tyson: Asked to comment on why “urban” is not included in addition to “rural”.
 - Ashely Desrosiers: Explained it was an oversight and the EJ WG emphasized the importance to not miss rural communities as they are frequently missed.
- Rick Balla: Asked how much was awarded for LISCIF as he is thinking about the future and how to meet the 40 percent.
 - Bessie Wright: Responded the pass-through \$ is \$1M/yr but this is a test as we need to see how many applications/awards are made. Mentioned there is room for expansion.
 - Leah O’Neill: Explained that in FY22, we allocated 3M to the EJ RFA, 1.5M for Chicopee and the remainder was split between CTDEEP and NYSDEC so we have flexibility to add more to the LISCIF in the future if successful the first year.
- Rick Balla: Asked about NY map and how it is set up.

- Kristen Laccetti: NYC only shows block groups. See: <https://nycdohmh.maps.arcgis.com/apps/instant/lookup/index.html?appid=fc9a0dc8b7564148b4079d294498a3cf>
- Jim Ammerman: Asked if it is up to the WGs to do it all on our own in the future and what is the plan going forward.
 - Bessie Wright: Responded there is no expectation to do it alone, one of the reason for the internal assessment, trainings, and discussions is to work together. Explained as we can have DEIJ trainings, the EJ WG won't be needed because the WG will give tools to other WGs to organically work EJ into work plans
 - Suzanne Paton: Emphasized the meaningful engagement and the needed support to figure out how to do this.
 - Nikki Tachiki: Mentioned this does put the responsibility on the work group chairs to incorporate EJ initiatives into their WGs, but no expectations.
- Vicky O'Neill: Explained the reason we do not have representation on our WGs is because they do not have time to come to meetings.
- Elizabeth Hornstein: Mentioned groups do have limited capacity and may not be the best way to engage groups and that we should attend events held by EJ communities.
- Alicia Tyson: Suggested holding meetings outside 9-5 allows flexibility and enhances inclusion.
- Nikki Tachiki: Commented CAC members can play a huge role in attending quarterly meetings.

Discussion Question 2: Get MC consensus on proposed ideas for ingraining EJ into decision-making: 1) Ask WGs to incorporate identified action items from EJ discussions into their annual work plans and 2) Incorporate EJ considerations into all funding proposals (e.g., LISFF, research awards, base proposals, etc.)

- Sylvain DeGuise: Responded yes and yes. Suggested documenting process as there are a lot of things going that may not have the metric (i.e., research grant program has been trying to increase diversity of panelists on the review team).
- Dave Lipsky: Asked if we collect projects where there is WQIP at a location where the community is unaware. Commented on the need to find what communities want but need to find needs governmental structure (municipalities) and the need to hire an individual to help municipalities to look at issues, gaps, or ways to improve new technologies. Stated the states need to provide information on the needs that are not being funded through the state funding mechanisms.
- Kate Knight: Highlighted that discrete tasks can be identified from cross-workgroup collaboration. Mentioned they are working with communities to produce model outputs to turn science into something tangible.
- Robert Burg: Mentioned the need for clear guidance on how to do this and an assessment on what we can do as we may get proposals that weakly address EJ.
- Julia Socrates: Expressed concern about making EJ a requirement as it may take a longer period of time to complete a project.

Break 10:23 am

Topic 5: Sustainable and Resilient Communities

- Elizabeth Hornstein: Talked about lessons the SRC team has learned in year 1 and the next steps on how to overcome barriers and challenges. Explained there are 5 SRC professionals with different assigned regions around the LIS. Gave an overview of the expected outcomes of their work. Explained how they conducted their needs assessment, who they reached, their findings and the major challenges that

continuously came up. Inadequate staff and capacity were the most common challenge described by these municipalities.

- Sara Powell: Expanded on major challenges. Went through next steps and ideas about how to address these challenges based on community feedback. Explained priorities for FY22 & FY23.

Topic 5: Facilitated Discussion

Discussion Question 1: How can LISS help address the structural capacity issues that have been identified across our regions?

- Bessie Wright: Asked about simple grant guidance and gave an idea on how to implement it.
- Nancy Seligson: Commented that local leader changeover is frustrating but sustainable groups exist with a few long-standing staff and it is important to pass this knowledge on to them. Mentioned they also have community knowledge.
 - Elizabeth Hornstein: Responded Lots of small villages in LI that do not have that, so it becomes a challenge.
 - Sara Powell: Commented on the Westchester side we know they exist and have been trying to work with them.
 - Nancy Seligson: Suggested they could write them letters about available grants.
 - Sara Powell: Responded they will be looking back at how the grant assistance goes and will get feedback on how to move forward.
- Brian Thompson: Pointed out goal to coordinate across all levels of government and that there has been a lot of capacity building. Emphasized that upper levels of government are also involved in the coordination process.
- Jennifer Street: Commented her organization does a lot of work with sustainable planning with municipalities and that they share many of the same issues. Mentioned money cannot go towards staffing unfortunately.
 - Elizabeth Hornstein: Replied that they have been highlighting states resources.
- Kelly Streich: Mentioned she is hopeful local officials will pass on message to elected officials, etc. so they are acting in the community's best interest.
 - Sara Powell: Mentioned she had a law intern to look into codes and ordinances and explained them to communities.
- Alicia Tyson: Mentioned eastern CT sustainable taskforces have been active on how to get past one person blocking efforts.
- Suzanne Patton: Reiterated the huge frustration about frequent change in leadership. Mentioned it is important to think about the whole community and not rely on a small sub-group. Asked how we can institutionalize changes.
 - Alicia Tyson: Suggested having communities gain strength and voicing their opinions.
 - Richard Friesner: Mentioned bringing succession planning in focus and including informal leaders in community if possible.
- Alicia Tyson: Mentioned CTSG has money from NOAA to engage community leaders about ecosystem health and sustainability with hopes the momentum leads to socio-economic successes. Mentioned the multi-town partnership in CT to help build a task force and steering committee for 4 towns (Old Saybrook, Westbrook, Fenwick, Clinton).
- Sara Powell: Mentioned NYSACC focuses on a coastal resilience network and NYS Climate Smart communities also help with regional collaboration.
- Sylvain DeGuise: Commented that it is critical to engage with people who don't necessarily have a voice.
- Robert Burg: Asked about the benefits of this type of work – how can we frame this in terms of homeowners?

- Jennifer Street: Mentioned there has been lots of success in upstate NY as something to look into for guidance.
 - Sara Powell: Responded that they are wanting to emulate that.
- Esther Nelson: Asked if there is any integration with utilities and if it would be helpful.
 - Elizabeth Hornstein: Responded she has been talking with utility groups in LI to do assessment of vulnerabilities of utilities.
 - Alicia Tyson: Mentioned eastern CT convos have taken place. Commented about the massive disconnect between utilities and business owners and how there is work to be done to reconnect that.
- David Lipsky: Reiterated that LI is unique due to small villages, township gov's, etc that lack cohesion in planning efforts and make it difficult to operate.
- Becky Shuford: Asked if there could be a flow chart laid out where people can reach out about how they are connected.
 - Jennifer Street: Suggested that they could help develop that as they focus on connections between governments.
- Suzanne Patton: Mentioned that DOT might not be incorporating stormwater ideas so that is a possible area for collaboration to provide guidance, community input, etc.
- Elizabeth Hornstein: Mentioned DEC and USACE worked on feasibility studies and no local partners are moving forward as there was a clear lack of coordination. Reminded the room to make sure to coordinate and listen to what those local communities want and need.
- Becky Shuford: Suggested making sure other agencies know we are here and could be a resource for them.
- Nancy Seligson: Asked if the communities are concerned about sustainability and resiliency.
 - Elizabeth Hornstein: Responded yes.
 - Alicia Tyson: Mentioned that certain areas have other issues such as food security, affordable housing that is exacerbated when natural disasters come through and we should try to come at it from both angles.
 - Marty Chintala: Asked if we know stakeholders who can help with that.
 - Alicia Tyson: Responded that is something we all need to build on.
 - Suzanne Patton: Mentioned all federal partners have initiatives but the SRC team is way out in front and it helps to know they are a resource.
- Bessie Wright: Mentioned one of biggest barriers is funding and we need to figure out how to strategically provide uplifting capacity but not totally support them.
 - Nancy Seligson: Suggested actually reaching out to social service agencies and use sustainability as an add on to what they are doing.
 - Samarra Scantlebury: Asked what the resource hub going to cap out at.
 - Elizabeth Hornstein: Responded that everyone has great suggestions but they are personally limited and the resource hub will be more targeted to governments and climate change threats.
 - Bessie Wright: Mentioned her comment was a general idea for LISS to consider in the future.
- Mary Arnold: Stated there is a need but there needs to be a want and we should look at how engaged these communities are. Suggested finding the most motivated individual to be the contact to help you.
 - Elizabeth Hornstein: Responded that some municipalities are very engaged, and some are not responsive or engaged at all.
- Jim Ammerman: Asked how they represent themselves.
 - Sara Powell: Replied they change how depending on the audience.

- Mark Tedesco: Asked what they would love to accomplish if there were no obstacles.
 - Alicia Tyson: Replied that stormwater comes up the most so that would be a priority. Added townships that refuse to change based on changing climate, flooding, etc also.
 - Elizabeth Hornstein: Reiterated that flooding and stormwater would be front and center and that there is no regional approach to protecting and restoring shorelines which is very needed.
 - Sara Powell: Mentioned stormwater management piece keeps coming up.
- Sylvain DeGuise: Mentioned there are challenges of rebranding but will bring a lot of capacity.
- Sue VanPatten: Explained how a group in LI forced counties to create coordinated efforts to address stormwater by giving them tasks and helped fund certain needs to get the communities to do the work.
 - Sara Powell: Responded there is a revival of a group similar to this in Westchester that she is looking to get involved in.
- Brian Thompson: Mentioned a lot of municipalities want help with stormwater but also help promote development in flood zones. Suggested more education on the issue and that it is a significant challenge in CT.
 - Alicia Tyson: Added that the tax base determines who makes those decisions.
- Lynn Dwyer: Asked where we can foster compliance is an incentive.
- Lillit Genovesi: Commented that it is scary to know her town government doesn't have the correct education, but it is helpful to know SRC plans to plan for education.
- Marty Chantala: Asked how we make funding more accessible.
 - Sue VanPatten: Suggested building capacity and spreading the word on what money is available and that it is urgent to apply for it now because it will not always be there.
 - Sue VanPatten: Mentions grant writers piece missing and is important for capacity.
 - Sara Powell: Stated the SRC team will follow up on that.
 - David Lipsky: Mentioned NYS website has multiple grants but may or may not be reviewed by small entities.
 - Alicia Tyson: Mentioned that in eastern CT grant writing a burden but managing the grant long term prevents people from applying in the first place.
 - Vicky O'Neill: Suggested making them aware there are grants for feasibility and how to figure out how to move forward, otherwise known as starter grants.
 - Jennifer Street: Mentioned social media has been helpful in getting that information out there and has had success.
 - Lynn Dwyer: Mentioned the hesitancy about how to manage grants and that there are programs to help those towns that don't have the capacity to manage the grant and teach them.
 - Richard Freisner: Mentioned the amount of effort to award a grant is not the same for \$1 million vs \$1000 and that capacity grants that help give resources to these people requires lots of effort.
 - Lynn Dwyer: Added that it is not just the grant writing but also the work to manage it and the challenge doesn't end when you get the grant.

Topic 6: Governance Document

- Casey Abel: Explained what the governance document is and what is in it. Gave an overview on update and edits that have taken place over the past few months. Reviewed process for approval and timeline. Asked for approval. See presentation.
 - Kamazima: Asked what happened if you don't get 2/3rd majority vote yes.
 - Casey Abel: Responded that we would go back and discuss to try to reach consensus.
 - Nancy Seligson: Asked why it is 2/3rd majority.
 - Casey Abel: Added that is it standard among other documents when consensus could not be reached.

- Samarra Scantlebury: Asked if there is an idea of a timeline for steering committee and policy committee approval.
 - Mark Tedesco: Replied we want to first work through the organization before bringing it to everyone and hopefully by end of year.
- Casey Abel: Mentioned a letter from CAC with the suggestion to help increase coordination of workgroups but did not see it as a need to change governance document. Stated that if there is no opposition, we will approve it. (No opposition). Asked if there is anything to bring up to the steering and policy committees.
 - Nancy Seligson: Mentioned giving success stories so they feel good about LISS.
 - Sylvain DeGuise: Suggested discussing the report to congress should be a priority.
 - Casey Abel: Stated she will note that and do the best to make it happen.
 - Leah O'Neill: Mentioned that topics might depend on when meetings are scheduled for.
 - Mel Cote: Asked if we could try to get a 2-hour meeting.
 - Casey Abel: Stated she will ask.
 - Mark Tedesco: Mentioned Gary Wikfors said the document was helpful for new staff at NOAA to understand LISS.
 - Esther Nelson: Suggested mentioning our expanding scope of federal partners.
 - Samarra Scantlebury: Asked when the last time these committees met was.
 - Rick Balla: Responded that they met pre-trump in Albany to discuss nitrogen strategy.
 - Chris Bellucci: Mentioned the potential for these groups to meet.
 - Mark Tedesco: Responded that they could do that, but the steering committee might mold what is presented to policy committee.
 - Richard Friesner: Specific asks from them since it has been a while since they met.
 - Jordan Bishop: Mentioned CAC had firm questions and commitments for when they met with the regional administrators.
 - Bessie Wright: Asked if they had they met before or after the 2015 CCMP.
 - Rick Balla: Replied not sure.
 - Brian Thomspson: Mentioned the CT side of the committee has new people who are not familiar with CCMP.

Wrap Up/Overview

- Leah O'Neill: Revisited the meeting objectives. Gave an overview of higher-level next steps for each topic. See presentation.
 - Suzanne Patton: Thanked Leah for the recap. Mentioned it would be helpful for WGs to describe their prioritization process for FY23 funds.
 - Leah O'Neill: Workgroups would come up with proposals then bring them to MC.
 - Samarra Scantlebury: Asked if projects in addition to BIL funded projects are supplemental or base.
 - Leah O'Neill: Explained that if it is expansion of another item then it can be base, but EPA is not interested in doing a competitive project and it should go through WG.
 - Sue VanPatten: Asked if it is not necessary to go through workgroup to secure base funding but only if we have a new project that needs funding.
 - Leah O'Neill: Responded correct. WGs figure out what is the best way to fund that project.
 - Jim Ammerman: Echoed Sue that now is the time for opportunity as our funding picture could change.
 - David Lipsky: Asked if BIL funds go through state revolving fund.

- Sue VanPatten: Responded not LISS money.

Close Out

- Mark Tedesco: Asked for feedback on how the meeting was run, the facilities, etc. Mentioned everyone talked a lot about processes but we have a lot of science projects as well such as bioextraction, monitoring, etc. Commented he is thankful to be in this position to be able to carry all of this out and we should make sure we take advantage of it while we can. Thanked everyone for their time and thanked facilitators. Mentioned we can hopefully do another in person meeting sometime in the future.