

Proposal #1 – Aligning Monitoring with CC

- Really outstanding proposal and are my top priority.
- Low score a reflection of the fact that the proposal as written were very unclear – fix will have to be fundamental (i.e. can't really figure out what question they are actually trying to address)
- Seems much of the workshop's success depends on preparations and review of materials prior to workshop
- I believe this effort is critically important and it is necessary to start working on this agenda as soon as possible. I understand it is necessary to begin somewhere and that the choice of three specific groups of living populations that are already well-studied has considerable value. However the scope of the issues associated with the linkages between temperature change and sea-level rise extends into much more complex relationships potentially affecting physical circulation patterns and stratification as well as biogeochemical cycling, phytoplankton populations and attainment of dissolved-oxygen goals. One cannot do everything within the scope of a single workshop, but I suspect these issues will require a longer time period to sort out and there would therefore be value in starting to discuss them sooner rather than later.
- Climate issues are critical, of course, and the use of three workshops on more defined topics may be a good way to proceed. However, the three topics proposed are all Bay focused; none address climate issues in the watershed itself.

Proposal #2 – Modeling Beyond 2018

- This is a very near second (to priority), my only concern is that it is a bit expensive compared with some of the other highest rated workshops.
- I propose that much of questions 2 and 3 be the subject of a lit review/synthesis prior to the workshop.
- Input from modeling research conducted in coordination with the Chesapeake Bay Program (Penn State's Center for Nutrient Solutions) intended to compare output with the Bay Model and model the integration of WIPs would provide insight
- Updating the CBP model(s) would be quite useful; this is an ambitious workshop, and there is not a lot of detail on how the three days would actually be used. More information on this would be helpful.

Proposal #3 – Dairy Farms

- Too NY centric and is lacking regional participation. They should be encouraged to reach out to other states.
- Almost exclusively NY focused. I would propose that a preliminary status paper be prepared and distributed prior to workshop deliberations.
- Lack of contact with model developers/maintainers; Positive: broad range of participants discussing model tools (modelers to planners to farm practitioners) to meet nutrient reductions and farmers' concerns
- The need to document dairy farms as full systems is critical; however, the proposal as written is focused just on NY state. PA of course has a lot of dairies; broadening this workshop beyond just NY would be important. Heather Karsten et al. at Penn State are working on a full system farm focused on dairies, nutrient management, and overall systems management. Others in PA are also interested, and I'm sure others in additional states would be as well. Another question that I had was what size dairies: all (including CAFO level), or some other size?

Proposal #4 – Legacy Sediment

- Proposal is really outstanding and are my top priority.
- Questions A, B, and D require upfront review and synthesis, not a workshop. I also question whether questions 1-3 are appropriate workshop material.
- Appears to meet the call from CBC for a well-rounded workshop on legacy sediments
- Legacy sediments is also a critical issue that is very frequently raised; having clear information on an area where there is not as much information would be very helpful.

Proposal #5 – Ecosystem Services

- This is also too geographically narrow in its proposal. The authors are encouraged to reach out to the various states and draw off the breadth of interest and expertise in this area.
- I recommend that a literature synthesis be prepared and distributed to participants prior to the workshop.
- Metric(s) produced to measure ecosystem services; well defined product to result from workshop
- Low score is primarily a reflection of the fact that the proposals as written were very unclear (at least to me). However, the fix to the proposal is relatively easy.
- I fully support the goals of the workshop but the scope of what is envisioned is quite broad given the wide array of ecosystem services that are envisioned. As an interim step in laying out an agenda for developing a framework I would support it, but I would be surprised if a two-day workshop can lead to the development of the framework. It certainly can identify where the science already provides the answers and where it doesn't, but I would not want it to be assumed that the workshop outcome will allow for actual development of the desired metrics in time for the 2017 midpoint assessment.
- To be able to more fully reach water quality goals through the Bay and its watersheds, there needs to be more benefits for local communities. This was clearly illustrated by the recent PA in the Balance workshop. Might also be useful to think about human health related issues as a direct consideration.

Proposal #6 – Water Clarity

- This could be better tied to management. It is a very good proposal but is not as strong as others.
- Appears to be more of a data analysis/lit review to look at trends in water clarity; email series of directed conference calls may be more appropriate.
- I fully support the idea but I think they have selected too broad a set of questions to be resolved within the scope of a two-day workshop. Questions 1 by itself would be more than enough for a separate workshop and this workshop cannot possibly resolve that question. I would support a more limited scope that starts with known trends in water-quality parameters in the tidewater system as a baseline and then focuses on links to water clarity.
- Water clarity & SAV is important, and synthesizing what is known could be a critical workshop. Any potential to tie to legacy sediment workshop above?

Workshop**Requested Funds****Estimated Timeframe**

Aligning Monitoring with CC	\$7500	March-May 2017 (flexible)
Modeling Beyond 2018	\$10,000	Fall 2016/Winter 2017 (firm)
Dairy Farms	\$8500	August 2016 (firm for Fall 2016)
Legacy Sediment	\$8500; up to \$2500 to be requested	Fall 2016 – Oct-Nov
Ecosystem Services	\$8500; \$2000 offset from EPA	Fall 2016
Water Clarity	\$8500; \$2000 offset from EPA	January-February 2017 (firm)

Total FY16 Workshop
Budget: \$40,000

Feedback

- Proposed Edits to RFP/Workshop Proposal Language:
 - Clarify Proactive vs. Responsive
 - Clearly identify chair/lead of steering committee
 - Individualized content in letter(s) of support
 - Be clear on flexibility of timeframe
 - Rationale as to why a *workshop* is the appropriate vehicle for activity