

Status and Trends Workgroup

October, 10 2018

Meeting Page:

https://www.chesapeakebay.net/what/event/status_and_trends_quarterly_meeting_october_2018

Minutes

10:00 **Opening and Introductions** (Laura Drescher, 10 minutes)

10:10 **Tree Canopy Indicator** (Julie Mawhorter, 30 minutes)

Julie reviewed the Vital Habitats Goal and Tree Canopy Outcome and progress towards each.

[See Tree Canopy Indicator presentation.](#)

DISCUSSION

Kristin commented that the WQ GIT on their call yesterday talked about putting the Tree Canopy on the Oct 22 phone call. Kristin also added that this is a good goal to look at the 2010 baseline.

Steve asked about counting agricultural programs that plant trees on retired lands- are these programs counted as increase in canopy? Julie responded that these programs are not counted in this goal. The focus is aimed more for towns and cities where people are concentrated since the benefits of tree canopy are enhanced. The agricultural programs and riparian buffers get credit in the TMDL, just not for this outcome.

Laura commented that this is a great example with the two-pronged approach of determining effort and then determining if the land cover data will be sustaining itself over time. Laura asked if the WIP and TMDL work is tied to this outcome? Julie responded that yes, the 2,400 acre goal might see a change in the future for this WIP III planning and alignment. Some states' goal numbers may go down, others may go up.

Laura asked Jen of the Climate Resiliency Workgroup (CRWG) about thoughts regarding the Tree Canopy tracking approach as well as how this approach will impact/help the CRWG. Jen will follow up with Julie about this tree canopy indicator about coordination to use this as an indicator for the CRWG as well. Julie responded that the CRWG ideas for this indicator are parallel to their own, so this could be a very doable arrangement.

10:40 **Tidal Trends Indicator** (Jeni Keisman and Rebecca Murphy, 30 minutes)

Jeni Keisman reviewed the background of the tidal water quality parameters as well as the annual process for producing these trends.

Rebecca Murphy reviewed the products that come from the tidal trends data, as well as how different views are useful for looking at the data.

Rebecca ended the presentation by discussing where this information has been posted in the past, on the ITAT webpage and soon to be on the WIP dashboard that John Wolf and others are working on.

DISCUSSION

Jeni asked if there is a more official location and audience for disseminating this information where it would be most helpful?

Status and Trends Workgroup

October, 10 2018

Meeting Page:

https://www.chesapeakebay.net/what/event/status_and_trends_quarterly_meeting_october_2018

Kristin commented that this is great information to understand better. This information informs many individual workplans, but is not an indicator that is directly tied to the agreement. With the Strategy Review System two-year timeline, it may be a strategic question to ask who would most benefit from this information and their workplans as they go through this process.

Catherine clarified that Chesapeakeprogress.com is for oversight groups and internal management groups. On the water quality standards page currently, there is a map of WQ standards attainment indicator, as well as flow adjusted pollution loads and trends from USGS. There is a level of detail in this tidal trends data that may not be needed for that purpose, but the higher level trends can still improve and add to what's currently there. This could also be a good place to add a link to the upcoming WIP data dashboard that was mentioned.

Doreen agreed with Kristin and Catherine. On ChesapeakeProgress.com, the WQ standards and attainment outcome, as it currently framed, the wording is focused on N, P, sediment, and improving water quality. At minimum, improving trends and tidal nitrogen phosphorus are relevant in this setting. There is a case to be made in showing a response to management actions in these clarity and DO parameters.

John agreed with Catherine and Doreen. The connection to the standards and outcome is clearly connected.

Peter Tango added that showing the mainstem of the Bay and the trends are helpful for the folks that have asked the questions about the data. This helps to show trends with the current status that is already presented in attainment.

Laura summarized that there is a level of info that should be on chesapeakeprogress.com because it communicates our capacity to monitor and assess WQ. Also, this info might be brought in to the SRS to showcase to people what's happening to consider when writing their WIPs going forward. In ChesapeakeProgress.com, we also want to link to the more technical data-heavy dashboard coming up. For the Chesapeake Bay Barometer, while not this year, most likely next year this data can be showcased in this publication.

John added that the WIP data dashboard is constructed as a series of modules, which don't have to be all in one place. Therefore there is flexibility in where this information could appear.

Laura finished by saying that she will share this information with the communications team.

11:10 **Brook Trout Indicator** (Steve Faulkner, Paige Hobaugh, 30 minutes)

Steve Faulkner discussed the brook trout outcome and goal, as well as sources of data.

[See Brook Trout Indicator presentation.](#)

Discussion

Status and Trends Workgroup

October, 10 2018

Meeting Page:

https://www.chesapeakebay.net/what/event/status_and_trends_quarterly_meeting_october_2018

Laura added that she'd like to show any spatial representation of the data discussed in this presentation and will talk offline with Paige and Steve.

Steve added that they worked with the Habitat Goal team to create the recent factsheets, but the real limitation regarding co-benefits is the anecdotal instead of quantitative information to back them up.

Steve asked about what was needed for a brook trout indicator? Laura asked the group if Steve's presentation of how to move forward with this indicator is acceptable to proceed?

Peter Tango asked what assurances were around that the states were comfortable in getting their info in within that 5 year period. Steve agreed that states are comfortable with this timeline. It's in their workplans.

11:40 Most Recent Data for Existing Indicators (Laura Drescher, 20 minutes)

Peter added that water quality standards attainment looks good for the new year.

Paige gave an update on Black duck- part of the workplan will be focusing on the new indicator, with more focus on habitat on the ground.

Jeni asked about submerged acres of vegetation and incorporation into this indicator? Paige agreed that these numbers were recently brought to the attention of the group as a better indicator in the fall for black duck.

Margot talked about stream health data numbers. There were more analyses done to determine better resolution. It looks like there's not much change in incorporating more than two stations. Margot is currently clarifying with ICPRB about data. Also, Claire Buchanan from ICPRB is working on the methods document.

Peter asked about using some analyses to fill in the gaps from any insufficient data with stream health. Margot added that the statistical analyses will be mentioned in the blurb in the Barometer.

For wetlands, Margo added that they are going with phase 5 model results. Hopefully all states will respond by Friday, Oct 12, which is the deadline to get in indicator information for Bay Barometer.

Laura added that Catherine is working on Climate Change Indicators and trends for the website and the Bay Barometer.

Jeni asked how connections in data are communicated? Catherine added that the first idea that comes to mind regarding climate include existing indicators for the bay: To look at all of the factors that are influencing outcomes, to see if there are patterns with others outcomes with these same factors. Jeni continued that it makes sense to keep it as clear and simple as possible to show connections.

12:00 Adjourn

Participants:

Status and Trends Workgroup

October, 10 2018

Meeting Page:

https://www.chesapeakebay.net/what/event/status_and_trends_quarterly_meeting_october_2018

Steve Faulkner, Margot Cumming, Kristin Saunders, Jeni Keisman, Paige Hobaugh, Rebecca Murphy, John Wolf, Mike Mallonee, Catherine Krikstan, Durga Ghosh, Julie Mawhorter, Rebecca Hanmer, Doug Austin, Jen Dopkowski, Cindy Johnson, Amy Williams, Doreen Vetter, Peter Tango

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Last Data Point</i>	<i>Update expected for 2018 Bay Barometer?</i>	<i>Notes</i>
Blue Crab Abundance	2018	No	
Blue Crab Management	2017 (up to date for 2018)	No	
Oyster Restoration	2017	Yes	Waiting on MD release of relevant report
Wetlands Restored on Agricultural Lands	2015	Yes	Have preliminary 2016 and 2017 data. Need to go through review process.
Black Duck	2015	No	Revising to habitat-based indicator
Stream Health	2010	No	
Brook Trout	?	No	
Fish Passage	2017	No	
SAV	2017 (preliminary)	No	Final data will be available at end of year
Forest Buffer	2016	Yes	Need to request 2017 data.
Reducing Pollution	2017	No	
Water Quality Standards Attainment	2016	?	
Toxic Contaminants Policy and Prevention	2014	?	2016 data should be available
Citizen Stewardship	2017	No	
Local Leadership		No	Baseline under development
Diversity	2016	No	Next update in 2019
Protected Lands	2015-2016	Yes	September 2018
Public Access	2017	No	
Student	2017	No	Next update in 2019
Sustainable Schools	2017 - corrected	No	2018 data available in Fall, but not before Barometer update
Environmental Literacy Planning	2017	No	Next update in 2019
Climate Resiliency	N/A	Yes	between 1-4 indicators

Status and Trends Workgroup

October, 10 2018

Meeting Page:

https://www.chesapeakebay.net/what/event/status_and_trends_quarterly_meeting_october_2018