



## **Nontidal Water Quality Monitoring Workgroup Meeting**

March 19, 2014, 1PM – 3PM

Meeting Materials: <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/21565/>

**Leadership:** Scott Phillips - Chair (USGS), Peter Tango – STAR Coordinator (USGS/CBPO), and Lea Rubin - Staffer (CRC/CBPO)

**Participants:** Bill Romano (MDNR), Claire Buchanan (ICPRB), Doug Moyer (USGS), Doug Chambers (USGS), Janine Howard (VADEQ), Mike Langland (USGS), Cindy Johnson (VADEQ), Ken Hyer (USGS), Hassan Mirsajadi (DNREC), Sherm Garrison (MDNR), Molly Pulket (PADEP), Steve Gladding (NYDEC), Kevin McGonigal (SRBC), Jennifer Greiner (USFWS), Joel Blomquist (USGS)

### **Overview of 2014 Chesapeake Bay Program funding for the Nontidal Network – Peter Tango**

After the budget cuts in FY13, the FY14 budget has been returned to the FY12 levels. Peter Tango will be working with all the partner agencies and organizations to finalize FY14 EPA funding. The two stations in NY, one in PA, and the DC stations that didn't get started in FY13 should not be officially returned to operation until we can commit to long-term sustainable funding. Funding for the Tidal Water Quality Monitoring Network has also been restored to FY12 levels.

### **Building Environmental Intelligence (BEI) process and next steps for evaluating water-quality Networks – Peter Tango**

#### **[BEI Overview](#)**

BEI is a three stage effort, including:

- Stage 1: What occurred during the FY13 budget cuts, and the efforts to deliver stop-gap funds
- Stage 2: The process of assessing the business model for CBP-funded monitoring, evaluate customer expectations and product deliverables, and optimization of the monitoring networks
- Stage 3: Evaluate monitoring for the outcomes of the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement

#### **Workgroup Discussion**

- Who will be doing the work for the integration of citizen science?
  - The bulk of this work will be done by an RFP awardee.

- The workgroup is interested in a justification from EPA for the amount of money being awarded to the integration of the citizen-based monitoring effort. Workgroup members would like to be involved in this conversation.
- The timeframe for this process seems long and does not align well with the funding cycle, this should be considered by STAR Leadership.

### **Evolving the functions of STAR and potential impacts to existing WGs – Scott Phillips, USGS/CBPO**

#### **[Revising Science Support Activities](#) – Document**

The purpose of revising the function and framework of STAR and STAR Workgroups is to coordinate monitoring, modeling, and analysis needed to update, explain, and communicate science to support the decision making of the Bay Program. This new function was founded on supporting the achievement of the goals and outcomes of the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement.

#### **Workgroup Discussion**

- How are the decisions going to be made within the STAR framework?
- If the main purpose of STAR is interact and communicate with the Goal Teams, the new STAR Workgroup Framework should include an outlined structure supporting that effort.
- How do we build a structure that increases productivity? What would be the motivation for the participants of these workgroups?
  - Joint products will be the main driver for partners. As well as more collaboration between Bay Program Partners and Goal Teams.
- With no funding from EPA, how do we get partners and academics to develop products such as peer reviewed articles?
  - The workgroup coordinators will be responsible for the development of products, whereas the workgroup participants will be the expertise informing and collaborating with the coordinators to ensure the use of the best available science.
- It is important to consider these questions (above) before finalizing the new STAR Workgroup Framework.