

Status and Trends Workgroup

Minutes

Sept. 12, 2017 from 1:00-3:00 PM

CBPO 305

Conference Line: 866-299-3188, access code 267-985-6222

Adobe Connect: <http://epawebconferencing.acms.com/stwg/>

Website:

http://www.chesapeakebay.net/what/event/status_and_trends_workgroup_meeting_september_2017

1:00-1:05 pm Opening (Laura Free, 5 minutes)

- Welcome and introductions
- Action Items from June meeting: None

1:05-1:20 pm Update: Preliminary Water Quality Standards Attainment indicator results (Peter Tango and Qian Zhang, 10 minutes)

Description: At the June Status & Trends meeting, the Water Quality Standards Attainment team discussed several options for further assessment or analysis to compliment the [Water Quality Standards Attainment indicator](#). At this meeting, the team will review the preliminary results for the existing water quality standards attainment indicator.

Desired Outcome: The Water Quality Standards Attainment team provides a sneak peak of the results of the water quality standards attainment indicator.

Qian reviewed the graphs within the [presentation](#). There is general increase in attainment in the early years, an up and down trend in the middle of the reporting, and a dramatic decline in 2011-2013. A general increase has occurred for four cycles. This is consistent with the UMCES Bay report card. Qian also introduced a table color coded to show attainment, with highest attainment in green, and lowest in red. This is preliminary data, with additional data on water clarity pending from the states. Qian also reviewed attainment by designated use, pointing out the overall attainment, and how open water and deep water components change together.

Qian also reviewed recommended actions, previously updated from the June presentation. More information will be extracted from the WQS attainment assessment, including exploration of “percent to attainment” and possibly “beyond capacity”. The focus of their work is to provide complementary information to the existing attainment indicator (not to replace it). Peter and Qian will also work with ITAT team to synthesize bay-wide segment-level attainment patterns, synthesize bay-wide station-level WQ GAM trends, and synthesize historical watershed inputs to each segment.

Kristin asked about priorities in the timeline of this attainment work, and noted that “creating linkages” with this work to the work of other groups was listed last in this presentation. Qian added that this is listed last because it is the most time-consuming. Doreen agreed that the synthesizing of this information with patterns and GAM trends would need to be done first to find the linkages.

Hassan asked if they were looking for loads or flow in the watershed inputs to each segment. Qian added that while this is early on in the process, they will look to loads and flow inputs to the watershed, and that it would be combined data from USGS and from the watershed model.

John Wolf asked about the timing of this indicator. Laura added that the data analysis and methods file is the focus of work first. While maps have been made in the past, there is not one on Chesapeake Progress yet. Catherine added that mapping attainment effectively has been attempted, but not done yet. Data can be updated without a map. There was difficulty to map all of the designated uses in one map in attainment, but the segments are different. It is a goal to have this map on Chesapeake Progress.

A future action item will be to brainstorm mapping options for attainment on Chesapeake Progress.

Qian added that they are approaching this attainment indicator from two angles: to make it more comprehensive and then to also create stories for particular segments to explain these trends. Documentation is fairly completed.

Doreen asked if there was a timeframe for this work? Qian responded that the further assessment of the indicator will be a year-long project at this time.

Kristin asked about this work and the ACE's mapping work and trying to make connections. Kristin has a draft analysis for several of the outcomes that would be good to compare with. Kristin forwarded this document to Peter and Qian to help guide this focus.

(The "Counting Types of Protected Lands" discussion has been postponed. More details on this indicator forthcoming at another Status & Trends meeting.)

1:20-1:45 pm Citizen Monitoring Cooperative- MOU (Liz Chudoba, Peter Tango 5 minutes)

Description: Liz will work with Peter Tango to introduce the foundations for development of a region-wide monitoring Memorandum of Understanding. A single page document will be created over the next 6-9 months regarding the collection, integration and application of Citizen Monitoring data into the decision-support resources of the Chesapeake Bay Program Partnership. Key themes will be introduced. A process will be proposed to move the MOU development through the organization of the partnership and up to the Principal Staff Committee.

Desired Outcome: Status and Trends workgroup members will be asked to review and comment on the proposed themes and suggest additions or deletions within the MOU document.

Laura asked what the role is for citizen monitoring and advancing the role of indicators. Is there an opportunity to use the CMC network to help gather this data that we're not currently tracking for some indicators.

Peter discussed the draft Memorandum of Understanding with the focus of citizen science incorporation into the decision frameworks of the CBP partnership. There was a previous agreement in 2004 to adopt common protocols within data collection that allowed for comparability of data across jurisdictions. This is similar in working with data of known quality to support decision-making within the partnership. This current draft is a work in progress. There is a need for comments and input so that the jurisdictions feel represented.

Peter reviewed the process and schedule of this MOU. This draft will be presented to STAR and its workgroups, including IMN, DI, and STAR, onward to CBP management, to then CBP coordinators and staffers by December, to Management Board by Feb 2018, with adoption hopefully by Spring 2018.

Liz summarized what this document is seeking to achieve: for the jurisdictions to acknowledge and commit to the tiered framework within the CMC system, and to use of the database that is being developed by CMC, and then to acknowledge the QAPPs and SOPs created, and to provide any support of training programs.

ACTION: This draft will be sent to the status and trends workgroup for comment within the next week.

Kristin suggested the idea of increasing jurisdiction buy-in and cooperation by highlighting their own groups' involvement, or the local benefits of this work.

Laura discussed the idea of building out to expand this MOU with monitoring that extends beyond WQ and benthic monitoring.

1:45-2:15 pm SRS Update and Indicators Framework (Laura Free, 30 minutes)

Description: Laura will provide an update on the biennial Strategy Review System and how some materials from this process may inform several items on the work plan for the Status & Trends workgroup relative to the Indicators Framework.

Desired Outcome: Workgroup members see how, in one area of the workplan, other members are advancing work outside of the workgroup meetings.

The Biennial Strategy Review System- Decision framework of adaptive management, adapted by the PSC. This is how the goal teams approach this framework. Every two years, each workgroup or team will go through this process to assess their performance and then how to adaptively manage to reach their goals.

Laura reviewed the SRS process, and how SRS connects to the Status and Trends workgroup mission:

- Enforcing the integrity of the indicators framework
- Working with goal teams to id info they need to track progress of their goals and outcomes
- Working to make sure there are up to date indicators for partnership products that communicate the work.

One of the workplan actions is to create "program examples of indicators framework in action". There are different types of indicators at the outcome level. A lot of workgroups are tracking performance indicators. Only a few groups are working on influencing factors and output indicators. The SRS includes a request for workgroups to complete a logic table to document the thought process behind the decision framework for all of the workgroups' actions, as well as to ID gaps and actions needed.

There is an opportunity to talk about the status of different actions listed in the workplans of the groups presenting. This will help to track if we're doing what we said we'd do.

Future Status and Trends meetings need to focus on the indicators framework and the information needed for adaptive management. Laura suggested that updates from cross-goal team workgroup members would be helpful to show how the workplan is being advanced. An example of this, at a previous meeting, was when Catherine presented the indicators online locations.

Kristin asked if the workplan would be revised based on what came from the SRS meetings? This will be revised next year, Laura responded. STAR generally asks for updated workplans at the beginning of the year.

Kristin added that the small SRS team might want to attend Status and Trends meetings as well, to help make sure that this SRS information is helping to inform the Status and Trends workplan.

2:15-2:30 Timeline Review- (Laura Free, 15 minutes)

Description: This standing agenda item will confirm data updates completed in the last month and list data updates occurring within the next month.

Laura will be out for 2 weeks, so few updates in September.

Wetlands restored agricultural lands- running into some questions of correctness for jurisdictions information, hoping to be updated in October. Two different indicators of water quality expected to come out in Oct: USGS assessment of N and P loads and river flow, as well as the WQ standards attainment that will be published on Chesapeake Progress in October.

Existing indicators- Laura is working on determining data availability for: planting forest buffers and newer sustainable schools indicator.

Expect to update toxic contaminants policy and prevention indicator (percent of tidal segments partially impaired) in October

New indicators: published possibly as soon as Oct. MWEs using 2015 data, and the possibly release of the Citizen stewardship team index.

2:30-2:45 pm Report Out of Action Items (Melissa Merritt, 15 minutes)

A future action item will be to brainstorm mapping options for attainment on Chesapeake Progress.

ACTION: This draft will be sent to the status and trends workgroup for comment within the next week.

ACTION	LEAD
ACTION: The draft of the citizen science Memorandum of Understanding will be sent to the Status and Trends workgroup for comment within the next week (Sept18-22).	Peter Tango, Liz Chudoba
A future action item will be to brainstorm mapping options for attainment on Chesapeake Progress.	Peter Tango, Qian Zhang, Catherine Krikstan and Comms Team

Adjourn (Next meeting scheduled for October 24, 2017 303).

Participants

Catherine Krikstan Chesapeake Stat team

ckrikstan@chesapeakebay.net

*Scientific, Technical Assessment and Reporting (STAR) Team
Chesapeake Bay Program*

Doreen Vetter	Chesapeake Stat team	vetter.doreen@epa.gov
Hassan Mirsajadi	DE	Hassan.Mirsajadi@state.de.us
Kristin Saunders	Cross-GIT Coordinator	ksaunders@umces.edu
Laura Free	Indicators Coordinator	free.laura@epa.gov
Melissa Merritt	STAR Staffer	mmerritt@chesapeakebay.net
Peter Tango	STAR Coordinator	ptango@chesapeakebay.net
Rachel Felver	Communications Director	rfelver@chesapeakebay.net
John Wolf	GIS	JWolf@chesapeakebay.net
Qian Zhang	STAR analyst	qzhang@chesapeakebay.net
Caroline Donovan	UMCES IAN	cdonovan@ca.umces.edu
Amy Williams		