



## Criteria Assessment Protocol Workgroup

Monday, February 4, 2013

10:00a – 12:00p

<http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/19113/>

### Participants

Peter Tango-USGS/CBP (Chair)	Liza Hernandez-UMCES/CBP (Coordinator)	Lea Rubin-CRC/CBP (Staff)
Richard Tian-UMCES/CBP	Jackie Johnson-ICPRB	Bruce Michael-MDDNR
Cleo Baker-VADEQ	Mark Barath-EPA	Sherm Garrison-MDDNR
Diana Muller-SRF	Tom Parham-MDDNR	Tish Robertson-VADEQ
Ken Moore-VIMS	Matt Stover-MDE	Andrew Muller-USNA
Cheryl Atkinson-EPA	Mike Lane-ODU	

### Minutes

---

#### Action Items

- Questions or concerns about the 2013 CAP WG Workplan should be directed at P. Tango and L. Hernandez.
- Ideas regarding measuring water quality standards incremental progress should be directed at L. Hernandez.
- Schedule SAV WG to present findings from SAV WG meeting about SAV assessment at a TMAW/CAP meeting in the spring (L. Hernandez, K. Moore, L. Karrh)
- Include a discussion on the shallow-water monitoring program next steps at a spring/summer TMAW meeting.
- Discuss the recalibration work and next steps of BIBI assessment (P. Tango, M. Stover, R. Batiuk)
- CAP WG members interested in participating in the April UCAT (Umbrella Criteria Assessment Team) meeting please contact L. Hernandez.

---

#### Discussion about 2013 Workplan (P. Tango)

Click to view [CAP 2013 Workplan](#) [subject to review and revision]

- Develop and provide recommendations for the remaining dissolved oxygen (DO) criteria currently without Partnership approval (UCAT et al.)
- Assess whether DO event duration is inherently captured by the CFD assessment and if not, suggest an alternative (UCAT et al.)
- Reevaluate the benthic assessment protocol (R. Llanso, D. Dauer, P. Tango,

- Address MD DO assessment concerns (L. Hernandez, M. Stover, R. Tian, H. Weinberg)
- Develop a new indicator for tracking progress toward achieving water quality standards goals (L. Hernandez, R. Batiuk, H. Weinberg)
- Develop protocol for incorporating nontraditional partner data (J. Johnson, M. Mallonee, M.E. Ley)
- Reevaluate the water clarity/SAV assessment methodology (K. Moore, L. Karrh, D. Parrish, P. Tango)
- **ACTION:** Questions or concerns about 2013 CAP WG Workplan should be directed at P. Tango and L. Hernandez

### **Water Quality Standards Indicator Update and Next Steps (L. Hernandez)**

Click to view [Water Quality Standards Indicator](#)

The Water Quality Standards (WQS) Indicator was developed to measure progress towards the achievement of the four jurisdictions' Chesapeake Bay water quality standards. This indicator will likely be adopted into the CBP framework after the February 27, 2013 presentation to the Management Board. The next step is to measure incremental progress by demonstrating how close the Bay is to achieving WQS attainment. Expect presentations to come about incremental progress reporting.

- **ACTION:** Ideas regarding measuring water quality standards incremental progress should be directed at L. Hernandez

### **SAV Update (P. Tango, K. Moore)**

The SAV WG is examining the three year assessment data for the determination of Water Quality due to SAV abundance and water clarity criterion. The first round of sampling at all shallow-water segments in both MD and VA are almost complete and therefore next steps are being addressed.

Possible next steps include:

- Targeting areas where progress is expected
- Addressing segments along the Eastern Shore of MD into VA, to involve both states
- The inclusion of climate change impacts to the water quality assessments

- Compare historic SAV areas to current SAV abundance when determining segments for targeted monitoring
- **ACTION:** Schedule SAV WG to present findings from SAV WG meeting about SAV assessment at a TMAW meeting in the Spring (L. Hernandez, K. Moore, L. Karrh)

### **Discussion and Questions**

- Under the TMAW workplan, TMAW is committed to “consider and identify options for next steps related to the completion of the baywide shallow-water monitoring program.”
- **ACTION:** Include a discussion on the shallow-monitoring program next steps at a spring/summer TMAW meeting.
- The SAV WG will determine the need for inclusion of the three year assessment cycle in the upcoming CAP Technical Addendum.

### **Benthic IBI Update (M. Stover)**

Click to view the [BIBI update](#) summary of key issues presented by M. Stover which includes; explanation of problems and potential solutions including add-on rules to the assessment methodology.

VA and MD noticed in the final BIBI assessment worksheet that several Bay segments were classified as being “not impaired” and yet had very low mean IBI scores and a high percentage of sites with BIBI scores that were below 3.01, the generally accepted threshold for biological impairment. The group discussed several potential solutions to this issue including warranting a Criteria 3 (insufficient information) determination and add-on rules to the assessment methodology to deal with such scenarios. The ideas presented here are not exhaustive.

### **Discussion and Questions**

- **ACTION:** Discuss the recalibration work and next steps of BIBI assessment (P. Tango, M. Stover, R. Batiuk)

### **January TMAW Adhoc Group Meeting Recap and Update (P. Tango, T. Robertson)**

Click to view [Presentation on variability of DO in near-shore vs. mid-channel monitoring](#)

UCAT met in January to develop recommendations for assessing the 7-day mean open-water summer dissolved oxygen criterion. E. Perry and T. Robertson evaluated a question that evolved

from that meeting, “Is DO more variable in shallow/near-shore habitats compared to deeper/mid-channel habitats?” T. Robertson compared the variability of DO in near-shore vs. mid-channel data from the York River and Rappahannock River from VA monitoring data from 2007-2009.

- The comparative study’s outcome supports that 7-day variability tends to be greater in shallow-water environments.
- The outcome will possibly differ when longer time scales are considered.

### **Discussion and Questions**

- The ranges in the standard deviations of the data are lower (i.e., less variable) in open-water than in shallow-water; this could be related to SAV abundance.
- Next step is to look at the types of sampling and the certainty of the fixed station monitoring program data and therefore conclude the validity of the conclusions drawn by the comparative study.

### **April UCAT Meeting (L. Hernandez)**

- Shallow-water vs. offshore water – should we assess separately for DO?
  - Meeting to be held on **April 4, 2013 in the Fish Shack**.
  - Meeting details can be viewed [here](#).
- **ACTION:** CAP WG members interested in participating in the April UCAT meeting, please contact L. Hernandez.
- The objective for the upcoming meeting will be to develop and present the implications of separating shallow-water from offshore open-water for DO criteria assessment. Currently the open-water assessment is inclusive of the shallow-water designated use in the DO assessments for the Bay; the UCAT will develop a list of pros and cons on the current and potential water monitoring assessment approaches.

### **NEXT CAP MEETING CONFERENCE CALL**

March 11, 2013  
10a-12p