



Status and Trends Workgroup Meeting

Wednesday, April 13, 2022

1:00 PM – 2:00 PM

Meeting Materials: [Link](#)

This meeting was recorded for internal use to assure the accuracy of meeting notes.

AGENDA

1:00 Opening and Roll Call, Announcements – Caroline Donovan, Chair

- Thank you for filling out Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) template for indicator updates!

1:10 Indicator Update Run-through and Discussion – Katheryn Barnhart, Coordinator

Katheryn gave a brief overview/reminder of the indicator update process timeline and requirements before she addressed the following questions.

- Does the indicators update calendar accurately reflect when your indicator documents are anticipated to be ready for review by the indicators coordinator (Katheryn)?
 - Olivia Wisner asked if the Sustainable Schools indicator is connected to the ELIT survey, which has been delayed. Katheryn replied that the Sustainable Schools indicator is now on a separate contract with ERG and that Katheryn and Doreen Vetter are the technical leads, so the data collection has already been initiated and this indicator is on track to be updated in April. Doreen said Erin Sullivan has been involved, and that Doreen will CC Olivia on those communications to keep her updated on developments. Olivia said she would be happy to be a second pair of eyes as needed and emphasized Shannon Sprague might be more up to date on this than herself.
 - Julie Reichert-Nguyen said more realistically the Climate Resiliency Indicator documents should be ready for review by July and fully completed by August.
 - Julie Mawhorter asked what the expected update timeline is for the Tree Canopy and Forest Buffers indicators. Katheryn said she has Tree Canopy down for June and Forest Buffers down for September. Peter Claggett said this seems accurate from the Land Use side. Julie Mawhorter said June is fine for now and they may need to adjust backward. Katie Brownson said the Forest Buffer indicator may be ready to update sooner, but it all depends on when 2021 progress is released. talked about forest canopy
 - Brooke Landry asked what the timeline being discussed is for and if it was about the Analysis and Methods document. Katheryn said yes, this timeline is for when the Analysis and Methods documents are updated and ready. Brooke replied that the SAV workgroup is dependent on VIMS for that information and it is typically available between May and June. This year they

aim to provide the updated information and Analysis and Methods document by May 15. Brooke asked if anything else needs to be updated. Katheryn said just the data file and Analysis and Methods Document need to be updated. After this information is submitted, usually Kaitlyn May will reach out with suggested edits to the web text.

- Peter Claggett said for the Land Use Methods and Metrics indicator and the Land Use Options and Evaluation indicator they intend to do a combined update because they are so integrated. They are still working on this because the Land Use Methods and Metrics indicator is more quantitative and the Land Use Options and Evaluation indicator is more qualitative. For ChesapeakeProgress, the only quantitative measure ready is Land Use Methods and Metrics. Katheryn agreed with this assessment.
- Peter Tango in the chat said the Water Quality Standards Attainment indicator looks good. For nitrogen, phosphorus, sediment, and flow trends, we may want to divide that for the future into River Input Monitoring (RIM) reporting (annually) and full Non-Tidal Network (NTN) + RIM (biannually). This year is different because it will include both but there is a 1 year lag in the time series between the RIM and the full NTN results that are presented. Peter added that historically RIM results have been reported annually because there are just nine sites, but for the full NTN results there are 123 stations so it takes longer. Peter commented that last week he reviewed the Analysis and Methods document for Water Quality Standards Attainment from Qian Zhang so I know we are close to being done.
 - Rachel Felver asked Peter Tango what the time period for the NTN + RIM results is for this year. Peter replied he will follow up with Rachel so he doesn't misrepresent the results, but commented that they are still wrestling with 2018 and 2019 being very high flow years. Breck Sullivan commented the RIM results are already out and NTN results will hopefully be released in May. Rachel said thanks, she is thinking about this in terms of the eventual press release.
 - Peter Tango replied to Rachel that This year we will have both RIM and the rest of the NTN through 2020. Chris Mason (USGS) is working on the NTN and there will be no offset this year. For Water Quality Standards Attainment, it is a downward score from last year and the details involve small effects on large areas of the bay in our analysis. For the future of Water Quality Standards Attainment, new James River criteria were established in Virginia. Next year we expect to have this update in our analyses as it take time to adjust the analysis code, and that work is underway. Also, Virginia is working on updating SAV goals on several segments - Brooke, its not this year but again a year or so out for accounting for segment based reporting, correct? Brooke did not respond.

- Bruce Vogt said that the oyster data updated are done during the winter but sometimes the reports get held up until the spring/summer. Bruce said he will check with his team to see if May continues to make sense for being the indicator update timeframe, and then will let Rachel Felver and Katheryn Barnhart what he learns. Justin Shapiro said for this year, the report is already publicly available so May should definitely work for this year.
- Mandy Bromilow reminded everyone she can work on blue crab updates after Chesapeake Bay Stock Assessment Committee (CBSAC's) spring meeting and the dredge survey numbers are official (usually in May), but the indicator updates shouldn't be published on the website until the advisory report is approved and published by the fish git (usually right before July 4).
- Are there any indicators with communication concerns this cycle that are a change from previous reporting periods or requests for changes to the way the data has been displayed for [ChesapeakeProgress](#)? (We suggest you take a quick visit to your outcome's page ahead of the meeting to make sure)
 - Olivia Wisner commented on the way the Public Access Site data is portrayed on ChesapeakeProgress. Olivia suggested having a line indicating where the 2010 baseline was. Katheryn agreed and replied it looks like a stacked bar graph, so it seems possible to add a line graph from the data file with the help of the web team when Kaitlyn May comes back. Doreen said that it would be good to add a number at a glance and the total number for all of the jurisdictions. Doreen and Katheryn will work with Kaitlyn May and Dan Brellis on the web team. Caroline Donovan said maybe the totals should be at the top of each bar and in the table on the other tab.
 - Mandy Bromilow said it might make more sense to show the Blue Crab Management outcome as complete given that the jurisdictions looked at an allocation-based management framework and decided against this policy. Mandy suggested reporting exploitation rates with the Blue Crab Abundance outcome since it ties into the population rates as this would streamline updates because then only one section would require updating.
 - Doreen Vetter replied that while the second part of the outcome is complete, Doreen and Katheryn are waiting to hear back from Carin Bisland about any steps that would need to be taken to the MB. Based on the first part of the indicator and the data, Doreen felt it almost seemed backwards to include them together. Doreen wants to make sure we can minimize workload, but also clearly report the first part of the outcome. A reasonable proposal might be combining them in the reporting on ChesapeakeProgress. Doreen said the bottom line is we need to wait to hear back from Carin on the process for how to move forward. Mandy replied this makes sense to continue the conversation another day with Carin. Bruce Vogt added that they did go the Management Board about the Blue Crab Management

outcome and they agreed that the outcome is complete and because of this decision they are not actively working on this outcome anymore. Doreen said because the data is still being reported, there is a need to explain/connect the data still being reported.

- Brooke Landry said there are no major changes for SAV.
- Julie Reichert-Nguyen said climate will be working on our edits for ChesapeakeProgress as we discussed earlier this morning.
- For new indicators: are there any questions/concerns about the upcoming update that could be addressed in this format? Would an individual check-in with the indicators coordinator once documents are drafted be helpful?
 - Peter Claggett doesn't have any questions at this time.
 - Julie Mawhorter says she will have questions but will not know which questions to ask until she can view the data. Julie said the focus will probably be on how to display the data since it will be a combination of tree planting, annual BMP data, and land cover change data. Katheryn asked if the Analysis and Methods document will need to be changed since it was drafted. Julie said they are going to try the original approach first for Tree Canopy data and they do need to update the A&M document. Katie Brownson added that the reporting for Tree Canopy in CAST has changed so they will need to look through the record to reconstruct history and run some custom scenarios. Katheryn asked which outcome would require this back casting to understand the expiration of BMPs. Katie said that since it has already been done for Forest Buffers twice it is fine, but this is the first time for Tree Canopy so that requires the back casting.
 - Katheryn reminded everyone that new indicators getting approved must first go through approval and presentation with their respective GIT, then they should come back and present at STWG for approval.
 - Julie Mawhorter asked what the order for presenting should be. Katheryn said they should get approval from the GIT first for maximum efficiency. For example, if you are trying to develop a new indicator by June, need to run through GIT first, then get it to the STWG team (Katheryn, Doreen, web team) for approval before they will post it to ChesapeakeProgress. Caroline Donovan asked for clarification. Katheryn said that for an Analysis and Methods document to be approved in June for a new indicator, it needs to be presented in May. Doreen emphasized this process only applies to brand new indicators.
 - Katheryn said if anyone wants an individual check in earlier in the process or need to get on the agenda, they should reach out to Katheryn at barnhart.katheryn@epa.gov.

- Open floor/round robin to confirm with any representatives who have not yet had the opportunity to share status of their indicator(s)
 - Katheryn asked for any suggestions for these meetings going forward? Was this helpful for getting into the mindset for updating going forward? There was no response.
 - Olivia Wisner asked if in the future the outcome representatives expected to attend were explicitly listed in the email and calendar invite. Katheryn agreed and said we will do this going forward.
 - Katie Brownson asked if approval from the STWG is about process or about the data itself.
 - Doreen said you don't need all the data, just the indicators you plan on using and the process. The goal is to provide insight early in the process so you don't do all the work and then we tell you to change everything. Katie asked if they have to get approval from the GIT first. Doreen said they can do that before the GIT if they would like to.
 - Olivia Wisner and Katie Brownson asked if GIT review is required for all indicators or just new indicators. Doreen Vetter replied it is only required for new indicators.

1:55 Next steps and Actions – Alex Gunnerson

- **Alex will share and post the compiled SOP document once it is complete**
- **Peter Tango, Qian Zhang, and Bruce Vogt will let Rachel Felver know when they are ready to start talking about press releases.**
- **Doreen and Katheryn will work with Kaitlyn May and Dan Brellis on the web team to provide a 2010 baseline or total number at a glance for the Public Access Site outcome data on ChesapeakeProgress.**
- **Arrange follow up meeting for reporting indicators for Blue Crab Management and Abundance Outcomes with Mandy, Bruce, Doreen, Katheryn, and Carin once Carin has had a chance to look over the information.**
- **In the future, the calendar invite will explicitly list out which indicators are expected to attend.**

2:00 Adjourn

Participants: Alexander Gunnerson, Amy Goldfischer, Amy Williams, Angie Wei, Breck Sullivan, Brooke Landry, Bruce Vogt, Caroline Donovan, Caroline Johnson, Cindy Johnson, Doreen Vetter, Hilary Swartwood, Jake Solyst, Jamileh Soueidan, Julie Mawhorter, Julie Reichert-Nguyen, Justin Shapiro, Katheryn Barnhart, Katie Brownson, Katlyn Fuentes, Mandy Bromilow, Olivia Wisner, Peter Claggett, Peter Tango, Rachel Felver.