

Status and Trends Workgroup Agenda

Sept 13, 2016 from 1:00-3:00 PM

CBPO National Park Service Large Conference Room

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

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

1:00-1:10 pm Opening (Laura Free, 10 minutes)

- Welcome and introductions
- Review action items from last meeting:
 - Laura will talk to the GIS team about any available “schools” layer and the GIS watershed boundary overlay to determine a count of the total schools in the watershed.
 - Laura added that she can pull out specific action items from last meeting’s discussion regarding the role and responsibilities of the work group for the Work plan. Laura asked for feedback from members after two weeks (Sept 27?)
 - Laura will follow up with Howard regarding the GIS Lead Role with the workgroup.
 - The Communications team will talk offline to come up with a few options to discuss updates and news with partners (ie- texts, internal newsletters simultaneous with public press releases)

1:10-1:40 pm Environmental Education Indicator Update (Catherine Krikstan, 30 minutes)

Description: Catherine will share an update from the most recent Environmental Education Leadership team meeting where indicator options were presented and discussed.

Objective: to share status of development of Environmental Literacy indicators, describe any challenges encountered, and determine whether and how the workgroup can contribute to overcoming these challenges.

The Environmental Literacy Leadership team reviewed the mock up graphs of Enviro Lit Indicators Sept 6 prepared by Catherine re: Sustainable Schools, Enviro Lit Planning, and Students (MWEEs).

Catherine is slightly adjusting the charts that are used for each indicator. The indicators that were settled on for the three environmental lit outcomes: Sustainable schools- will utilize percentage of certified sustainable schools (Elem. Middle. High.) within boundaries of Bay watershed. This data is not from the elit survey, but pulled from various certification programs. For the enviro lit planning outcome, which measures preparedness to implement environmental education programs, the indicator will be the preparedness of reporting local education agencies to implement these programs- a self-reporting status. For the student MWEE outcomes- this indicator will be the number of students enrolled in elementary, middle and high, by school that provide system wide MWEEs. This is also self-reported.

We have information on some schools that provide MWEEs. But one of the next steps that needs to happen is to figure out what is worth presenting. Because if you have a student enrolled in a school that offers some MWEEs, it’s not a given that that student will actually experience a MWEE, so what does that number mean? These numbers need to be refined further. The environmental education leadership team will dig into this issue further.

However, the more straight forward sustainable schools outcome can move forward once the total schools within the watershed is known.

Catherine wants to confirm the next steps with Laura and this group.

Laura noted that the ELIT team needs a count of the total schools within each jurisdiction in the watershed, or a GIS file that we could impose the watershed boundary on to determine number of schools within the watershed. Carin added that the GIS overlay should work.

ACTION- Laura will talk to the GIS team about any available “schools” layer and the GIS watershed boundary overlay to determine a count of the total schools in the watershed, and will also keep in touch with Shannon Sprague on the progress of these indicators.

1:40-2:25pm Discussion: Drafting a Workplan (Laura Free, 45 minutes)

Description: The Coordinator will review a draft workplan, and workgroup members will discuss changes or additions. Staffer will make changes to workplan in meeting based on feedback.

Objective: to comment on and edit draft workplan, so that the Coordinator can present a draft workplan at STAR meeting on September 22. To articulate, within the workplan, the role of this workgroup and its members in supporting the Indicator Framework.

[See Document.](#)

Prioritizing needs and completing the Indicator Framework

Laura wants everyone to review this document for transparency of follow up tasks with goal teams regarding indicators.

Peter added that the replacement for Mindy Ehrich’s STAR analyst position will be able to help evolve these items in this document.

Laura reviewed the workplan draft document for this work group. The role of this workgroup and its members should be really clear within this workplan. This workplan includes scope of work, partners, and key actions of the Status and Trends workgroup.

Given the mission and scope of work, there are three categories: Applying an indicator framework to existing indicator suite, Supporting Indicator Development, Completing the Indicator Framework: Indicator Needs Assessment.

Are these the right categories? Do they reflect the big ideas of our mission? DISCUSSION

Catherine discussed the title of “Completing the Indicator Framework” could be confusing, because we already made an indicator framework document, as well as look overwhelming if you think of it as an ongoing process. It might be better to cut it out or make it a subtitle.

Carin agreed that there needs to be a way to differentiate, possibly worded “indicator needs assessment” to help the partnership expand beyond performance indicators.

Kristin wondered who is responsible for creating indicators? Some thought it was the workgroup, some thought coordinators, some thought GITs with input from the Status and Trends Workgroup. The second question is, when do we begin to move beyond indicators and reporting and drive to management change? Kristin believes there’s a role here for the Status and Trends workgroup. Carin clarified that this

question is one of differentiating between the development vs use of indicators. Kristen wanted to ask how the workgroup would characterize Indicator involvement in the role of higher management. This workgroup is critical to the Biennial Review.

Zoe added that with Climate, indicators will be chosen to show that there is need for more progress in certain areas as well as to incentivize more progress, to show where there is a need. Carin confirmed that the indicators and metrics that we're using are really tied to step-wise information (of actions and reactions) about how to assess and drive progress.

Greg Allen added that the workgroup along with GITs can fulfill the role of ensuring that a metric is valid in assessing the question at hand, that the data is also sufficient behind it. But Status and Trends could add value to make sure that the data quality behind the measures is solid. What is the group's role in making sure the metrics that are used are valid to help understand and measure goals and outcomes?

Carin answered that this is a connector workgroup between GITs and others. Any QA/QC questions about data might be more connected to STAC. This workgroup might be more of a filter, a first step. Peter added that most groups who bring indicators forward should already have documentation developed. Carin added that goal team 6 is similar in its function as this group. This workgroup will play an important role in making sure indicators are completed, with proper documentation, and with the right integrity of the data, and connected with resources/groups to address any concerns/questions.

Jennifer added that Kristin's question might fit more with "bucket 3". This focuses more on, "what is the trend," and then translating this question in a way that leads to storytelling, to show the difference it's making. Carin asked if interpreting trends was the role of the workgroup, or the role of the GITs? Peter continued that there are checkpoints that can help with this group to help adjust and continue adaptive management. Carin added that this point, the hypothesis of what and when we're expecting results has not been addressed in the adaptive management process very much. Is the role of this group to make sure that the GITs take this responsibility if the trends are really off, to sound the alarm? Carin then stated that the Biennial Review will help.

ACTION- Greg Allen added that Karl Hershner and STAC had once broached this topic regarding progress assessment and adaptive decision-making. Carin agreed that this is a good question to ask Karl.

Peter added that the annual report/bay barometer was significant to determine progress on indicators. Carin said that this is just a report of how we're doing, doesn't really address management of how we're doing. Peter asked if the barometer SHOULD become a management tool, to trigger discussions on what we're going to do differently. Greg added that we're trying to time the biennial strategy reviews with the release of indicators.

Catherine added that this group has discussed a question previously, "When an indicator is updated, changed, created, who brings that indicator to management board", and the decision was that the spokesperson for that indicator should be the GIT. The Status and Trends group would provide a status update that would include indicators updated, changed or created, but the GITs would be empowered to lead the conversations around the indicators themselves. This decision is relevant to this discussion because we decided to place more responsibility with the GITs than this group in leading discussions about indicators.

Kristen added that it would be helpful to think of the workplan in relation to the two year timeline, in collaboration with STAC and STAR. This could provide guidance to writing the workplan.

Catherine continued that a lot of the work with this discussion is very internal. Unsure if a partner should be the comm team or workgroup, but fostering this internal communication is a piece of the strategy.

Carin added that this workgroup should not have the expectation to hold information for all 31 outcomes of all GITs. But this workgroup needs to instill consistency and guidance in how to develop and use these metrics.

Laura added that she has ideas of how this group will relate to the biennial review process. It sounds like this group is reaching consensus that this review will be the main driver of management decision in the program.

Greg added that it could still be the role of the workgroup to help guide and coach the process for indicators and effectiveness.

Laura had included in the workplan a portion about working with coordinators to look at changes or alternatives with indicators. The biennial review process should help with this. Carin furthered the idea that there may not be enough resources to create the perfect indicator, but rather the best indicator with available resources.

Jennifer discussed “adaptation” wording in the second bullet of “Align current indicators” on the workplan. This could be limiting after discussion of all the ways that this group can work with indicators.

Kristin asked, to the extent that indicators don’t get put into the mix for funding, can this group work to identify looking for things that fall into the gap area and finding a way to get them completed? Laura responded that this question refers to the 1st bucket, Indicator needs framework. Peter added that maybe a bucket needed is “orchestrating support for indicator development”. Kristin agreed and asked further, how do we make sure that the indicators that we need are there?

Carin added that there are many metrics being created that will not always have funding going towards them. So who takes care of that then? Budget and finance? This workgroup? It will be an issue to consider of identifying barriers to indicator development and maintenance. In this workplan, there still needs to be a needs assessment for the barriers of creating, developing, and maintaining indicators.

Peter asked if this group could help bring multiple groups together to do a brainstorming session to determine answers to these questions brought up in this meeting. Carin shared a brainstorming session technique with the premise that there are no more resources than what is currently available, help groups first look at creative ways to make do with what’s available, requiring strategic thinking: Apollo 13 roundtable.

Zoe added that the climate’s recent GIT funding (Climate Change Indicators) could help with this indicator process, determining the adequacy of the indicators the Bay Program already has to help assess climate change.

ACTION Laura added that she can pull out specific action items from this discussion regarding the role and responsibilities of the work group. Laura asked for feedback from members after two weeks ((October 6)

Laura would like to move on to members of the work plan. Laura wants to make sure that the proper groups and their roles are reflected accurately in the workplan.

Kristen discussed participation and, as cross GIT coordinator, she can help bring connections between GITs, to think about overarching stories. These connections might need to be made on a more regular basis, such as in quarterly meetings for goal team chairs, staffer/coordinator meetings, etc.

Rachel Felver discussed the communications group involvement with the stories and appropriate audiences for indicators, as well as involvement in the trends process.

ACTION- Laura will follow up with Howard regarding the GIS Lead Role with the workgroup.

Catherine discussed the webteam's work with communicating on Chesapeake Progress. This includes communication products that track progress towards the agreement.

Peter discussed the role of STAR Coordinator- facilitating the support needs and gaps and how to help fill those gaps- providing STAR team support. Laura would like to communicate with Peter on the in-house capacity to fulfill these gaps.

INDICATOR NEEDS ANALYSIS CHART 1:21:00

Kristen asked that we just funded a bunch of projects, so what's left? Laura added that a lot of these indicators have parts in progress. Some outcomes are very expansive, where Carin asked how can we help fill these gaps most effectively?

Jennifer added that brook trout indicator, it will be difficult for the states to pay for it. There are several indicators that might help create an expectation that cannot be met.

Carin discussed LiDAR high resolution data and how it might be helpful to determine gaps.

Kristen added that the more that we can put these lists in front of groups with capacity, the more that they might see the opportunity to help. We need to ask this question to different groups that we don't normally ask. Carin continued that this could be done at the biennial process.

Laura reiterated that STAR and STAC should be engaged early in this process, as well as informed of our needs and where these indicators are in terms of status and the specific barriers. This could be ideas for agenda items next month.

2:25-2:30 pm Timeline Review (Laura Free, 5 minutes)

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

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

[See Document.](#)

Planting forest buffer information was just recently updated. We will soon be updating NPS loads and river flow, as well as WQ Standards attainment and monitoring indicator (combining Chlorophyll a, dissolved O, and water clarity).

Kristen asked if any internal communication occurs within our office about our own updates and indicators and such. Kristen would like to institutionalize these communications. Carin added that this would need to be simultaneous or post release.

Management Board updates- how do we make these updates more digestible and more-widely read?

ACTION- The Communications team will talk offline to come up with a few options to discuss updates and news with CBP and its partners.

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

TOPIC	TIMEFRAME	LEAD
ACTION- Laura will talk to the GIS team about any available “schools” layer and the GIS watershed boundary overlay to determine a count of the total schools in the watershed, and will also keep in touch with Shannon Sprague on the progress of these indicators.		Laura Free
ACTION Laura added that she can pull out specific action items from this discussion regarding the role and responsibilities of the work group. Laura asked for feedback from members after two weeks (Sept 27?)		Laura Free
ACTION- The Communications team will talk offline to come up with a few options to discuss updates and news with partners.		Rachel Felter/Comm Team
ACTION- Greg Allen added that Karl Hershner and STAC had once broached this topic regarding progress assessment and adaptive decision-making. Carin agreed that this is a good question to ask Karl.		(built into workplan)

Adjourn (Next meeting scheduled for November 8 from 1-3 pm in NPS Large Conference Room.)

Future Agenda Items

Topic	Timeframe	Lead
Status & Trends Workgroup Workplan	Fall 2016	Laura Free
Exploring a Forage Fish Indicator	TBD	Bruce Vogt

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

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?	Fall 2016	Workgroup members

Participants

Carin Bisland	Chesapeake Bay Managers	Bisland.carin@epa.gov
Kristin Saunders	Cross GIT Coordinator	ksaunders@ca.umces.edu
Catherine Krikstan	Chesapeake Stat team	ckrikstan@chesapeakebay.net
Cindy Johnson	VA	Cindy.Johnson@deq.virginia.gov
Greg Allen	Toxic Contaminants	allen.greg@epa.gov
Jennifer Greiner	Vital Habitats/ GIT2	jennifer_greiner@fws.gov
Kara Skipper		kara.skipper@noaa.gov
Laura Free	Indicators Coordinator	free.laura@epa.gov
Peter Tango	STAR Coordinator	ptango@chesapeakebay.net
Rachel Felver	Communications Director	rfelver@chesapeakebay.net
Reggie Parrish	<i>(Diversity and Local Leadership)</i>	parrish.reginald@epa.gov
Zoe Johnson	Climate Resiliency	zoe.johnson@noaa.gov