



DELAWARE CENTER FOR THE
INLAND BAYS
 Research. Educate. Restore.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS' MEETING MINUTES

*Center for the Inland Bays
 Indian River Inlet Facility
 December 13, 2019
 Approved March 6, 2020*

ATTENDANCE

<i>Board Members Present</i>	<i>Center for the Inland Bays Staff</i>
Richard Mais (SCAT)	Chris Bason
Susie Ball (Chair, Board-Elected)	Brittany Burslem
Claire Simmers (CAC)	Marianne Walch
Mike Dunmyer (Board-Elected)	Anna Short
Todd Lawson (Sussex County)	Andrew McGowan
Aimee Isaac (Board-Elected)	
Ken Sigvardson (Board-Elected)	<i>Board Members Absent</i>
Gerard Esposito (Board-Elected)	Lori Reynolds (EPA)
	Sec. Michael Scuse (DDA)
<i>Other Attendees</i>	Sec. Shawn Garvin (DNREC)
Megan Mackey (EPA)	Pat Coluzzi (Board-Elected)
Mike Bott (DNREC)	David Baird (SCD, Treasurer)
Ted Becker (SCAT)	
Catherine Magliocchetti (EPA)	<i>Board Alternates Present</i>
	Chris Brosch (DDA)
	Terry Deputy (DNREC)

CALL TO ORDER/INTRODUCTION

Chair Susie Ball called the meeting to order at 1:32 PM and led the board in the pledge of allegiance. The meeting attendees introduced themselves.

SECRETARY'S REPORT

S. Ball requested a motion to approve the previous meeting minutes, Mike Dunmyer made the motion and Ken Sigvardson seconded. The vote was unanimous.

TREASURER'S REPORT

Chris Bason presented the report in the Treasurer's absence. He directed attention to the updated board budget summary and pointed out an increase in approximately \$500,000 in revenue due to new income sources and roll-over of unspent funds the previous year. C. Bason informed the board that the finance committee recommended the report for approval. Aimee Isaac made a motion for approval and K. Sigvardson seconded. The vote was unanimous.

C. Bason directed the board's attention to a report on the history of the operating reserves account. A balance goal of \$356,303 (25% of the total budget) was set in 2017 and C. Bason informed the board that goal is on track to be attained within the original targeted timeframe (2021).

C. Bason informed the board that we have a draft audit in hand which appears clean. The finance committee will review and it will be presented at the next board meeting.

OTHER REPORTS

Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)

Claire Simmons reported that a rebranding of CAC meetings to a Citizen's Cafe has been approved. The new format will consist of one or two 10-15 minute presentations followed by open discussion.

Science and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC)

In Jenn Volk's absence, Marianne Walch informed the board that the STAC met on November 1st and heard two presentations. The first was from Tina Callahan from the University of Delaware on the Delaware resilience awareness project, the second was from Dr. Louis Plough from the University of Maryland on a research technique called environmental DNA. STAC provided reviews on the draft white paper for developing a new hydrodynamic water quality model which will be presented to the board after finalization and a vote to approve.

Development Committee

M. Dunmyer reported the 25th-anniversary gala was a success with a net amount of \$41,000 raised. The development committee is now focusing on the Annual Appeal and a Capital Campaign for James Farm.

Anna Short gave a more in-depth presentation on the annual appeal, explaining letters went out earlier this year and were much more personalized than in past years. A. Short shared a report on the development program's performance indicators showing growth for almost all indicators.

Sussex County

Todd Lawson reported the county is wrapping up a working group that was formed to address an update to the county code related to buffers and buffering certain water resources. S. Ball inquired whether the proposed new ordinance would mirror or be more in line with DNREC's recommendations. T. Lawson answered yes, that they have had input from DNREC as it relates to the resources and what should be protected and how. T. Lawson reported that of the five councilmen there was one likely yes vote and one likely no vote, with three unknowns. S. Ball inquired whether there was anything the board could do to assist in getting the proposed ordinance passed. T. Lawson responded that he had talked to C. Bason about some strategies and that he would let the board form a strategy based on those conversations.

OLD BUSINESS

No Old Business.

NEW BUSINESS

Resolution to authorize executive director as signer on investment account

S. Ball read the resolution as follows: The Board of Directors hereby appoints the Center's Executive Director, Christopher Bason, as the authorized signer on behalf of the Center on the Vanguard institutional investment account and requested a motion to approved. Jerry Esposito made the motion and K. Sigvardson seconded. The vote to pass was unanimous.

CCMP Revision Update and FY2019 Leveraging Report

Michelle Schmidt gave an overview of the CCMP timeline beginning in 2017 and extending to the present, and detailed the decision to move from a CCMP update to a CCMP revision. M. Schmidt then presented the timeline going forward updated as a result of EPA input. The updated timeline would complete the process in December of 2020.

K. Sigvardson inquired as to what determines whether an update or a revision was needed. Megan Mackey answered that recent guidance dictates the CCMPs are now a 10-year document with a required update every 5 years. S. Ball asked M. Mackey and Cathy Magliocchetti if they had any comments on the information Michelle had presented. M. Mackey clarified the difference between a revision and an update is not minor. S. Ball inquired if it was necessary to prolong the process one year past our original completion goal of December of 2019. M. Mackey answered the EPA was okay with the proposed timeline going forward and was less concerned with the timeline and more concerned with the finished product. S. Ball expressed that CIB felt differently as M. Schmidt's time is tied up in working on the CCMP and there were several projects that could not begin until the CCMP was complete.

S. Ball then opened the floor for questions and comments and began by reading a statement from board member David Baird who was not able to attend the meeting. D. Baird's statement expressed his views that the requirement of additional review seemed to be moving the process backward rather than forward. D. Baird expressed the signatory agency he represents has been given ample opportunity to review and discuss with their board, staff, and stakeholders. D. Baird expressed in his statement that he does not feel the extended timeline will result in more than what is already available.

S. Ball then asked the other signatories who were present to share their responses to the required additional review and comment period. Chris Brosch stated DDA contributed significantly to the CCMP update and that the requirement to review and comment on a revision is redundant because so many elements of the update were relevant to the revision. C. Brosch stated DDA would not have any further comments and looked to the EPA to comment toward the Center's revised timeline to determine where we can streamline processes and combine comment periods.

Terry Deputy expressed that DNREC supports the Center's revision and that if the timeline as presented gets to a product that is acceptable to EPA it would be supported by DNREC. He stated that DNREC wants to ensure they are fully engaged but that time for the sake of time does not benefit anyone and if the timeline can be streamlined DNREC would be in support.

Todd Lawson stated he echoed what D. Baird and C. Brosch had expressed. He said he did not know what more could come out of an additional year's worth of work and that he was doubtful that anything would change from the County's perspective. He expressed his desire to see the

timeline expedited and to see the CCMP in action.

Mayor Ted Becker echoed what had already been said and stated he thought there was a lot of work to be done once the document was complete and that there would be nothing further from SCAT's perspective to be added.

Claire Simmers said she had nothing additional to add except that CAC would be in favor of expediting the process and would not have anything additional to add to the document.

S. Ball opened the floor to board members to ask questions. J. Esposito asked what gets delayed with the expansion of the timeline. C. Bason responded that M. Schmidt's time would go to the additional work required rather than her full workplan. J. Esposito clarified whether that meant we were spending money on administrative work rather than the implementation and C. Bason answered yes. C. Bason expressed his feelings that the extended process as required by the EPA would reduce partner engagement. S. Ball inquired whether there was work in the timeline that would be affected by this new time table. C. Bason answered that specific projects that would be delayed due to M. Schmidt's time being spent on additional CCMP tasks would include grant proposals, the Rapid Assessment Project Plan, coordination of the CCMP implementation committee. He also mentioned the new requirements would take up his time lessening his ability to fundraise and complete other tasks.

K. Sigvardson expressed that the process seemed excessive and asked whether there has been complex content thus far that has warranted multiple reviews. M. Schmidt responded that several actions required extended conversations, revision, and re-sharing but that portion of the process has been completed and that she does not believe there will be anything in the narrative portion that would require extensive review. K. Sigvardson expressed that it seemed like there was an opportunity to streamline and accelerate the process as it appears the signatories do not have a problem with an abbreviated timeline or the document as a whole.

M. Schmidt stated the EPA would like an additional technical review which may result in comments that require back and forth with partners to make changes to actions and performance measures. M. Schmidt said she was not sure what to expect from the public comment period but that it may result in more back and forth to hammer out details. K. Sigvardson inquired whether M. Schmidt expected any significant changes between the first and second EPA technical reviews and M. Schmidt answered no.

C. Brosch asked how much time the CIB needed to get to a draft that EPA could review for technical elements and that the public could comment on. M. Schmidt answered we were currently in an extended STAC review period that would end on Friday at which point edits may need to be made based on comments, those comments and edits would then be shared with the signatories for review. C. Brosch recommended taking STAC's comments to the signatories with a tight deadline for which the document would be turned over to the EPA for a 60-day technical review in conjunction with a full signatory review.

J. Esposito seconded that recommendation and inquired whether the timeline as presented was the CIB's or EPA's. M. Schmidt responded it was CIB's timeline driven by comments by EPA that our process was not engaging enough because we did not receive any comments from signatories and their desire for a 60-day public comment period. J. Esposito asked whether a different timeline was a possibility.

T. Deputy expressed that the signatories have a responsibility to be fully engaged and that to the extent that the signatories can remain fully engaged and the timeline can be streamlined it should be.

S. Ball asked for comments from M. Mackey and C. Magliocchetti. M. Mackey expressed she would be in support of streamlining the process aside from the full STAC review and the 60-day public comment period. M. Mackey stated that to her knowledge EPA has encouraged CIB to involve EPA in review sections along with other signatories so that the technical review would not generate demonstrative changes or suggestions. S. Ball asked M. Mackey where we were in that process and M. Mackey answered that she has only seen the CCMP outline and a bit of narrative but has not been provided a full draft for review nor did she see drafts of certain sections when other signatories were reviewing and working through sections. M. Mackey expressed that it was good to hear that sections had been worked through together and that the truncated signatory review now made more sense.

M. Schmidt stated the reason the EPA has not yet seen a draft is that the timeline that was agreed upon in April stipulated signatory review before EPA review. S. Ball inquired as to when we could get a draft to the EPA and M. Schmidt answered by February following the January STAC meeting. C. Bason suggested we clarify with Jenn Volk whether an additional STAC meeting to talk about the comments they provided was necessary. Marianne Walch commented that several STAC members were employed by other signatory agencies so while they may not have provided comments through STAC they may have been engaged through other workgroups and reviews.

C. Bason informed the board the reason we received so many comments during our initial public comment period was because it was a simplistic survey. He expressed his opinion that our public comment period on the full document would have a similar response to PDE's. He reiterated that he felt the 60-day comment period was unnecessary and that a 30-day period would suffice. M. Mackey responded that she was also the program coordinator for PDE and that the public was more engaged throughout the entire process thus resulting in fewer public comments. M. Mackey expressed that she did not feel the EPA was going to accept a shorter comment period and that we should move forward with the 60-day period. S. Ball asked whether we could open public comment before EPA returns the document after public review. M. Mackey responded that was not a requirement but that there would be value in EPA reviewing ahead of time because if EPA has a great deal of comments it would benefit the public to see the version that addresses those comments.

M. Dunmyer suggested shortening the review periods within the timeline aside from those that have already been stipulated as non-negotiable. M. Schmidt informed the board she had provided ample time for the various review periods because the EPA had previously said that a 15 business day period for signatory review was not long enough.

C. Brosch asked whether it was possible to break the required 60-day public comment period into two 30-day periods, the first of which running concurrent with the EPA technical review. M. Mackey said she would need to ask the program coordinator at headquarters. She also agreed there was padding in the timeline and that she thought a month could be shaved off there rather than breaking up the public comment period.

C. Magliocchetti stated there was no need for a board motion to revise a timeline. She inquired what the negative outcome would be by continuing with the proposed extended timeline. C. Bason answered that we could be losing the buy-in and engagement of the stakeholders if we went with the extended process, as well as experience a delay in several projects as detailed earlier

in the meeting. M. Dunmyer suggested writing a new aggressive timeline that makes leaner assumptions. S. Ball requested M. Schmidt, M. Mackey, and C. Magliochetti to work together on a leaner timeline and provide an update at the next Executive Committee meeting.

Executive Director Update

C. Bason gave an update on what the Center has been doing over the past several months, including participation in mediation in the Mountaire legislation, the 2019 NEP Tech Transfer Meeting, and the Read Avenue Living Shoreline project.

C. Bason then gave an update on the Center's 3-year strategic plan. Of the actions due in FY19 55% have been completed and the remaining 45% have been initiated.

A. McGowan delivered a presentation on the Center's Eelways Project.

ADJOURNMENT

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 3:38 PM
Respectfully submitted,
Susie Ball/blb –