

## Status and Trends Workgroup MINUTES

June 14, 2016 from 1:00-3:00 PM

Joe Macknis Memorial Conference Room (Fish Shack)

Conference Line: 866-299-3188, access code 410-267-5731

### 1:00-1:15 pm Opening (Laura Free, 15 minutes)

- Welcome and introductions
- Review action items from last meeting:
  - Workgroup members to review revised processes prior to this meeting, with a decision to approve or disapprove these processes at this meeting. – [To be reviewed in today's agenda.](#)
  - Coordinator to revise Timeline for Upcoming Indicators based on feedback from May meeting. – [A draft of this timeline will be reviewed in today's agenda.](#)
  - Shannon to work with Catherine and others (e.g., Doreen, Laura, Mindy) to mock up visualizations of indicators for Environmental Literacy Outcomes – **ACTION-** [Mindy will forward the data provided by Shannon to Catherine to continue this graphing task.](#)
  - Coordinator to invite select workgroup members to meeting of Environmental Literacy Leadership Team (completed) - [The invitation for this workgroup meeting went out. If anyone would like to attend that did not receive the invite, contact Laura Free.](#)
  - Coordinator to begin drafting workgroup schedule/strategy (in progress)- [This is an ongoing action item. Today's agenda item regarding the Card Sorting Outcome should help inform this item.](#)

### 1:15-1:45 pm Indicators in Development: (15 minute update and Q&A for each)

*Objective:* This agenda item will feature presentations or discussions led by outcome representatives (GIT coordinators, staffers, or other outcome leads) as they develop new indicators. Specific topics will change each month as needed.

*Desired Outcome:* Workgroup is knowledgeable about the direction of development and knows when the workgroup can next expect to engage on each of these indicators.

#### Citizen Stewardship indicator (Amy Handen)

#### [SEE PRESENTATION.](#)

[This topic is also slated for the Management Board Meeting for June 16, 2016.](#)

[Amy reviewed the data gathering process to help track human behavior as it pertains to stewardship actions such as: stewardship behavior, future likelihood of adoption of certain behaviors, potential for volunteerism, individual engagement, and other civic engagement actions. Amy noted that this assessment tool is not about verifying implementation, or measuring public policy preferences, or measuring attitudes unrelated to stewardship behaviors. This assessment helps to illustrate which behaviors, such as septic pumping, pesticide use, rain barrel usage, etc. are most used, as well as which behaviors are most likely to be adopted. This information can help local groups/governments best tailor their public outreach programs.](#)

Amy also reviewed the challenge of combining and prioritizing the results of the assessment to create indicators of citizen stewardship. Hopefully within 2016/2017, an assessment that is statistically significant at the state level will be conducted to help local groups and communities to develop their own plans.

Amy added that, once an indicator is more established, the Status and Trends Workgroup can help with outreach regarding the indicator, particularly to local governments and other groups who engage with the public.

## DISCUSSION

Laura mentioned that the development of this indicator is not only with the idea to show progress to the oversight groups, but also with partners' needs in mind. Amy added that this indicator information should be made available to local groups, so that they can understand what the data says about their local jurisdictions.

Laura asked for an explanation of the links among the indicator tracking behaviors, the outcome ("increase the number and diversity of trained and mobilized citizen volunteers with the knowledge and skills needed to enhance the health of their local watersheds"), and the larger stewardship goal ("increase the number and the diversity of local citizen stewards and local governments that actively support..."). Laura wanted to clarify that the Stewardship group had determined that voluntary behavior falls under the "volunteers" mentioned in the Outcome. Amy agreed with this statement, and added that the Stewardship group really focused on increasing the number and the diversity in the number of stewards, with "stewards" defined in the strategy under a spectrum of volunteering (personal actions or more leadership actions) in their communities.

Catherine asked about what geographical information is collected with these questions. Amy responded that in the assessment, there are questions about the participant's address.

Howard asked how these efforts would be replicated to show progress. Would you have to ask the same people the same question? Amy responded that if the study is a statistically significant pool, the exact same participants would not be needed. The assessment process would just need to be comparable in how it was executed.

Doreen asked at what scale were they trying to focus on in regards to statistical significance. Amy responded that the assessment in the winter was conducted watershed wide and is statistically significant at that level. The next level would be at the state jurisdiction level. The goal is to hopefully become statistically significant at the local level, especially with local groups' increasing interest in conducting the assessment tool themselves.

Catherine asked if all of the assessment questions are included with the responses in the data that would be available for groups to search. Amy said Steve Robbe of Opinion Works knows the protocols needed to conduct the assessment, and those protocols would need to be taken into account to replicate the assessment.

Doreen asked if it was considered by the Stewardship group to weight more certain behaviors that would further the goal of improving the health of the watershed, as well as lend themselves to cross-outcome priorities and assessment. Amy added that this relates more to the individual engagement

questions in the assessment tool, such as a person's effect on clean water or intent to improve water quality individually. Doreen discussed that this would probably require a more county level, to better observe patterns. Laura added that expert input will most likely be needed in weighting certain practices and their effectiveness for improving the health of the watershed.

Kristen asked what the budget shortfall for this Stewardship Indicator project: Amy responded that the shortfall was \$105,000.

Doreen asked about the sustainability of the funding for this assessment and indicator development. Amy said it has been suggested to stagger the assessment in different areas at different times each year, since requesting money every three years is not as easy to maintain as requesting funds annually. The stewardship team is still discussing the frequency at which the assessment will be completed.

Amy finished by reviewing the next step of this process. Once decisions have been made about ranking behaviors, Amy would like to present to the Status and Trends workgroup the summary for what the Stewardship indicator might look like. Catherine asked if, at that time in the project, a summarization of the project could be posted on ChesapeakeProgress, such as an explanation of how the indicator is being developed as well as the distribution of the assessment. Amy agreed that this would be a good idea.

**ACTION-** Stewardship group will report back when indicator is farther along in development.

#### **Establishing a baseline for Diversity (Reggie Parrish)**

##### **SEE PRESENTATION.**

This topic is also slated for the Management Board Meeting for June 16, 2016.

Reggie Parrish reviewed the upcoming implementation of the Diversity Team's Demographic Profile Tool to help gather data both from the Chesapeake Bay Program and Program partners, to establish a baseline from which to measure progress towards the Diversity goal/outcome to include "groups that are not currently included in the decision making and implementation of conservation and restoration activities...". The Diversity profile is made up of ten questions, include questions about gender, race, sexual orientation, location in terms of rural vs. urban, etc., as well as questions to help determine the level of decision making power of the assessment takers. The profile, to be conducted by the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, will be given to the Principals Staff Committee, Management Board, Advisory Committees, GITS, and workgroup members. Reggie also shared a timeline for the progress of this baseline development, with results from the assessment to be presented by summer of 2016.

Reggie mentioned Green 2.0 as an initiative that pushes for transparency of environmental organizations in terms of their diversity. Green 2.0 is an initiative dedicated to increasing racial diversity across mainstream environmental NGOs, foundations and government agencies. The Green 2.0 working group advocates for data transparency, accountability and increased resources to ensure that these organizations increase their diversity. For more information about Green 2.0, click [here](#).

#### **DISCUSSION**

Laura asked for clarification on whether the group should encourage the GIT leadership, or ALL GIT members to take this assessment. Reggie confirmed that all workgroup membership should be

encouraged to participate. Amy asked about the fluid nature of workgroup membership and whether that would matter in regards to who took the assessment. Reggie answered that the focus should be on the consistent attendees, people who provide input and stay involved in activities.

**ACTION-** Status and Trends Workgroup Members should encourage ALL GIT active members to take this assessment.

**1:45-2:10 pm Indicator Process** (Catherine Krikstan, 25 minutes)

*Objective:* The workgroup will offer any feedback on the revised processes for updating existing, adapting existing, and establishing new indicators. These processes were originally discussed at the initial workgroup meeting on April 7, and have been revised according to workgroup feedback in that meeting. Workgroup members should review the processes prior to the meeting and come prepared with any comments, questions or concerns.

*Desired Outcome:* Workgroup members approve the revised processes and they can be presented to the STAR team prior to implementation.

**SEE INDICATOR PROCESS DOCUMENT.**

Catherine reviewed the feedback from the original April 7<sup>th</sup> Status and Trends meeting and the corresponding updates to this process. Today this document will be opened up to the group to confirm these changes and if there are any final questions or feedback before it's finalized on the Status and Trends website.

Amy wanted to confirm the understanding that an indicator can be updated without an accompanying press release. Catherine discussed that that information is currently not reflected in this document, but this should be discussed with Rachel Felver, Director of Communications. Doreen added that communications decisions should be covered by the Fig.1, Step 2 of the process, and that this "communications plan" referenced in the document should cover the timeline and vehicle of the information release.

**ACTION-** Catherine will add feedback regarding the timeline and proper channels of communication to this Indicator Process document in the second step of the document. Laura and Catherine will also talk more to Rachel for this step.

**ACTION-** Laura and Melissa will then add the updated Indicator Process document to the Status and Trends group page.

Kristin asked whose job is it to initiate the steps outlined in this process, particularly when it comes to developing a new indicator. Laura responded that we have chosen not to specify who performs the actual developing of the indicator since it depends on the indicator in question. Amy added that someone should be the shepherd of these indicators through this process. Laura asked if it would be appropriate if workgroups should come to this group to explore options for indicator development and to determine if CBP has in-house expertise or requires funding for outside expertise. Kristin said both the Status and Trends Workgroup, as well as the workgroup with the indicator in question, should be involved in moving this indicator development process forward. Kristen mentioned the Climate Resiliency workgroup as an example of a group that will need this type of assistance from the Status and Trends workgroup. Laura agreed that this is why diverse participation in this group is important.

Laura asked the workgroup if this process document, once changes discussed in today's meeting were incorporated, worked for the group. It was agreed that this group accepted these steps with feedback discussed in today's meeting to be incorporated.

**2:10-2:40 pm Results from Outcome Sorting Exercise** (Laura Free, 30 minutes)

*Objective:* The Indicators Coordinator will report out on the results from the sorting exercise conducted at the June 2<sup>nd</sup> Coordinators/Staffers meeting, where coordinators and staffers in small groups sorted pieces of each outcome statement into two groups. Group A contained pieces of outcome where the Partnership could track trends, a number target was stated, or the outcome included a definition of a measurable state. Group B contained outcome pieces where the Partnership needs to take a specific action or create a specific output. The Coordinator will summarize the results and will lead a discussion on how this sorting will help prioritize our work.

*Desired Outcome:* The workgroup reaches a common understanding on how this sorting assists in agenda setting and prioritizing work to adapt existing and establish new indicators.

Laura reviewed the results from the activity given to participants of a recent Coordinators/Staffers meeting with the goal of prioritizing outcomes into two groups. The purpose was to solicit feedback on which outcomes the group believed should be measured with a quantifiable indicator, and which outcomes are better address through a qualitative description to track progress. This activity was a first step towards prioritizing the work for the Status and Trends Workgroup. In order to prepare the outcomes for this activity, Laura had approached the Goal Team Staffers and Coordinators in advance about their plans to track progress on specific parts of their associated outcomes. If it was confirmed that their group would track progress on that component of the outcome, then it was included in the sorting activity.

**SEE PRESENTATION.**

The results of A outcomes were sorted into three categories: The green text indicated outcomes that currently have existing indicators. The black text represents indicators currently in development, and the red text represents outcomes that currently have no indicators existing or in development. Outcomes labeled with asterisks currently have components in group A and group B. Laura proposed that the group should focus on the more quantifiable group A components of these outcomes before moving towards group B components (for outcomes that have pieces in both groups). For the results in the B category, Laura noted that the outputs that are called for in the different outcomes in this category might lead to an output indicator or output for another outcome.

Doreen wanted clarification on the Group A outcome slide regarding the 2017 and 2025 WIP text colors. Laura confirmed this was a copy typo.

In the presentation, Laura explained why some outcomes should probably be reclassified in a category than what they were placed by the sorting activity responses. Laura proposed a piece of the oyster outcome, which was voted to group A, to be switched to group B. The student outcome was voted into group B, but Laura proposes that this outcome moves to group A, since they do have some quantifiable component (one MWEE). Laura proposed the same move for the Water Quality Standards attainment, which was originally placed in group B, but has a quantifiable component and should therefore go into group A.

## DISCUSSION

Catherine asked if the Fisheries GIT had discussed how they would be tracking the oyster outcome. Laura replied that Bruce Vogt sent an excel spreadsheet with their outcome responses, and the Fisheries GIT had placed the oyster outcome in category B. The oyster outcome reads, “Continually increase finfish and shellfish habitat and water quality benefits from restored oyster populations.” Catherine believed that this outcome is a side effect of what can be measured in category A. Catherine asked if the oyster outcome isn’t classified in group A, should it even be on the tracking list at all? Doreen added if they’re not planning on tracking progress towards this outcome, if this group disagrees with that, Doreen believes that this is a workgroup role to make recommendations in these situations. Mindy confirmed that this outcome is definitely one they want to track, but perhaps more of their focus is towards the second part of the outcome, “Restore native oyster habitat and populations in 10 tributaries by 2025 and ensure their protection”.

Laura then asked what the group’s opinion was in moving forward with the oyster outcome classification. Laura reiterated that she agrees with Bruce and the Fisheries GIT’s classification of group B. Catherine responded that she doesn’t think it should be included on this B list because she doesn’t know how to qualitatively track increasing habitat restoration. Catherine continued that this portion of the outcome would be taken care of by the more quantifiable goals. Doreen added that the first portion of the outcome, increasing finfish and shellfish habitat and water quality benefits, is more of a validation for the rest of the outcome, restoring native oyster habitat. Doreen concluded to move the outcome to group B. Kristin added that this outcome may become A, but this outcome should not be taken out of priority.

Laura then asked the group about the WQ Standards Attainment, and if they agreed to sort it to group A. The group agreed to add this WQ outcome to group A.

Laura also discussed how work in group B actually include outcomes that we are currently developing indicators for right now. This demonstrates how WGs are taking a qualitative outcome, and adding a quantifiable component to them.

Laura asked if the workgroup agreed with these outcome characterizations and what benefit the group felt in this exercise and its direction of workgroup priorities.

Mindy suggested that the outcomes that are closest to acquiring an indicator should have first focus, mainly the quantitative ones.

Amy asked about what kind of assistance this workgroup would be able to provide in developing indicators. Would it be in the form of feedback and discussion, recommendations, or funding, etc.? Laura added that the prioritization process will help core workgroup members assist with developing indicators that have been sitting on the back burner up until this point. This group can then identify resources and other opportunities for further indicator development/updates.

Amy asked if there was a draft Status and Trends WG workplan. Laura responded that a scope of work is currently available for this workgroup. Efforts to prioritize the work for this group are still underway, and once those are more identified, a workplan can then be created.

Regarding the prioritization of the indicators: Doreen commented that the outcomes that are more qualitative right now, most likely are more long term endeavors. The outcomes that have quantitative outcomes can probably be undertaken and pushed over the finish line in a shorter amount of time. Amy agreed that these outcomes can be grouped in this fashion with a focus on the more quantitative group A first, but would defer to the group's judgement on this issue. However, those in group B should not be neglected. A balanced approach to ensure movement in all directions would probably be most beneficial. Doreen said that there is a need to prioritize however, due to funding constraints, etc.

Kristin pointed out that this list of outcomes and categorization can help inform things such as the upcoming GIT funding proposals. Amy agreed with this cross GIT collaboration.

Howard added that it might be good to prioritize these outcomes to see if some of them have a geographic component or not. For those that do, there is in-house GIS expertise here to help. Doreen added that this group can help direct workgroups to appropriate resources to further their work.

**ACTION** -Laura recapped that we need to take a closer look at these outcomes, the in-house capacity to work on them, and the potential of a geographic component. The group felt that there needs to be a focus on the indicators that are moving forward, while not forgetting the outcomes that have more long term tracking needs. The preference of the workgroup is to have some way to discuss all of the outcomes, and then to focus on where there are indicators, but to also figure out how to talk qualitatively about the other outcomes where there's not a lot of information right now. Laura suggested that possibly another activity can help clarify the workgroup's priorities on this issue.

#### **2:40-2:45 pm Timeline Review (Laura Free, 5 minutes)**

*Objective:* This standing agenda item will confirm data updates completed in the last month and list data updates occurring within the next month. These updates may be more helpful in the beginning to provide context for the workgroup; they may be unnecessary as the workgroup becomes more active in these processes.

*Desired Outcome:* Members are aware of completed and upcoming data updates and can resolve timing conflicts or other issues offline with the Indicators Coordinator.

Laura reviewed a draft of the timeline that is still under construction to better categorize the upcoming indicators. Forage fish will likely be on the agenda for an upcoming meeting. Other upcoming work on indicators in June include blue crab, N,P,S loads and river flow, and WQ Standards attainment.

**Action-** Laura and Melissa will work on updating and color coding this timeline by each goal.

Mindy added that the WQ Standards Attainment information is behind, but she and Mike Mallonee will be working on that information before she leaves on June 30<sup>th</sup>.

#### **2:45-3:00 pm Report Out of Action Items (Melissa Merritt, 15 minutes)**

ACTION	TIMEFRAME	LEAD
Stewardship group will report back when indicator is farther along in development.		Amy Handen



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

Status and Trends Workgroup Members should encourage ALL GIT active members to take the Diversity Demographic Profile Assessment released in June.		Workgroup members
Catherine will add feedback regarding the timeline and proper channels of communication to this Indicator Process document in the second step of the document. Laura and Catherine will also talk more to Rachel for this step as well.		Catherine Kriskstan Laura Free
Laura and Melissa will then add the updated Indicator Process document to the Status and Trends group page.		Laura Free Melissa Merritt
Laura will create an activity that helps the group take a closer look at how to priorities the tracking of outcomes, the in-house capacity to develop and work on them, and the potential of a geographic component.		Laura Free

**Adjourn** (Next meeting scheduled for July 12 from 1-3 pm in the same location)

**Future Agenda Items**

Topic	Timeframe	Lead
What outcome statements in the "Non-Measurable" document can we move into the "Measurable" document, based on the information we would acquire rather than the outcome itself?	To be addressed in Coordinators/Staffers meeting	Laura Free
Fuller discussion of distinguishing between measurable and non-measurable outcomes	To be addressed in Coordinators/Staffers meeting	Workgroup members
Developing a Citizen Stewardship Indicator	June 14, 2016	Amy Handen
Establishing a Baseline for Diversity	June 14, 2016	Reggie Parrish
Discussion: Options for an Oyster Indicator	Summer 2016	Bruce Vogt/Mindy Erich
Exploring a Forage Fish Indicator	Summer 2016	Bruce Vogt
Can GIT coordinators view media - such as maps - before they go live, in an update (as is done in an adapted or new indicator process)?		
How do key actions in the work plans relate to an indicator?	Summer 2016	Workgroup members



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

Brainstorming and voting activity: What are our workgroup priorities for 2016? For the next 6 months? For the next 3 months?	Summer 2016	Workgroup members
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------	-------------------

**Participants**

Amy Handen	<i>(Citizen Stewardship)/ Public Access</i>	<a href="mailto:amy_handen@nps.gov">amy_handen@nps.gov</a>
Catherine Krikstan	Chesapeake Stat team	<a href="mailto:ckrikstan@chesapeakebay.net">ckrikstan@chesapeakebay.net</a>
Doreen Vetter	Chesapeake Stat team	<a href="mailto:vetter.doreen@epa.gov">vetter.doreen@epa.gov</a>
Hassan Mirsajadi	DE	<a href="mailto:Hassan.Mirsajadi@state.de.us">Hassan.Mirsajadi@state.de.us</a>
Howard Weinberg	GIS team	<a href="mailto:hweinber@chesapeakebay.net">hweinber@chesapeakebay.net</a>
Julie Walker	Stewardship GIT	<a href="mailto:jwalker@chesapeakebay.net">jwalker@chesapeakebay.net</a>
Kristin Saunders	Cross-GIT Coordinator	<a href="mailto:ksaunders@umces.edu">ksaunders@umces.edu</a>
Kyle Runion	Habitat GIT	<a href="mailto:runion.kyle@epa.gov">runion.kyle@epa.gov</a>
Laura Free	Indicators Coordinator	<a href="mailto:free.laura@epa.gov">free.laura@epa.gov</a>
Lea Rubin	Izaak Walton League of America	<a href="mailto:lrubin@iwla.org">lrubin@iwla.org</a>
Melinda Ehrich	STAR Analyst	<a href="mailto:mehrich@chesapeakebay.net">mehrich@chesapeakebay.net</a>
Melissa Merritt	Staffer	<a href="mailto:mmerritt@chesapeakebay.net">mmerritt@chesapeakebay.net</a>
Reggie Parrish	<i>(Diversity and Local Leadership)</i>	<a href="mailto:parrish.reginald@epa.gov">parrish.reginald@epa.gov</a>