

Monitoring Meeting

January 22, 2025



Water Quality Standards Attainment and Monitoring

*Peter Tango, USGS, Monitoring
Coordinator*

*Breck Sullivan, USGS, STAR
Coordinator*

Through the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement, the Chesapeake Bay Program has committed to...



Goal: Reduce pollutants to achieve the water quality necessary to support the aquatic living resources of the Bay and its tributaries and protect human health.

Outcome:

Continually improve the capacity to monitor and assess the effects of management actions being undertaken to implement the Bay TMDL and improve water quality. Use the monitoring results to report annually to the public on progress made in attaining established Bay water quality standards and trends in reducing nutrients and sediment in the watershed.



B

Big Question

Provide advice to the Management Board on whether "to consolidate, reduce, update, remove, replace or add new outcomes."

Current Outcome

Continually improve our capacity to monitor and assess the effects of the management actions being taken to implement the Chesapeake Bay Total Maximum Daily Load (Bay TMDL) and improve water quality. Use monitoring results to report annual progress being made in attaining water quality standards and trends in reducing nutrients and sediment in the watershed.

Current Outcome

Continually improve our capacity to monitor and assess the effects of the management actions being taken to implement the Chesapeake Bay Total Maximum Daily Load (Bay TMDL) and improve water quality. Use monitoring results to report annual progress being made in attaining water quality standards and trends in reducing nutrients and sediment in the watershed.

Current Outcome

Continually improve our capacity to monitor and assess the effects of the management actions being taken to implement the Chesapeake Bay Total Maximum Daily Load (Bay TMDL) and improve water quality. Use monitoring results to report annual progress being made in attaining water quality standards and trends in reducing nutrients and sediment in the watershed.



Outcome Feedback

- *Previous Strategy Review System*
- *STAR Meetings*
- *Monitoring Meetings*
- *WQGIT Office Hours*
- *Survey*



What is the value of the outcome (as currently written)?

- Accountability
- Common monitoring and analysis framework, multi-partner network
- Commitment to observed data and not just modeled achievements
 - Importance of funding
- Stakeholders can view progress on CBP commitments to clean water
- Assessment enhances learning cross partners



What is your advice on the WQSAM Outcome? - Monitoring

We need Monitoring Capacity as an Outcome in the Agreement

Please use the slider to indicate your agreement with the above

3.0

Strongly disagree

Strongly agree



What is your advice on the WQSAM Outcome? - Monitoring

Need monitoring in outcome

- Need to assess all tidal criteria, need to attain criteria
- Need outcome because monitoring helps with delisting segments
- Need more monitoring in the watershed

Do not need monitoring in outcome

- Current language is not an outcome – monitoring is activity
- Activities are important but not needed as outcome
- Not an outcome on ecosystem response
- Consolidate with similar outcomes



What is your advice on the WQSAM Outcome? - Results & Trends

We need Monitoring Results or Trends as an Outcome in the Agreement

Please use the slider to indicate your agreement with the above

3.6

Strongly disagree

Strongly agree



What is your advice on the WQSAM Outcome? - Results & Trends

- Assessing the improvements made in WQ as a result of implementation is completely different from assessing WQS which is an inherent state function. Partnership should focus on data collect and trends
- We have multiple publications quantifying the pace of change now. Translate the CBP request to “accelerate recovery” based on published baselines making the outcome quantitative
- Reporting progress should not be annual – maybe every 2 years
- Incorporate monitoring results/trends into evaluation of progress/success; Broaden scope of monitoring beyond N/P/S
- Show ecosystem ends in conjunction with loads/trends, and changes in practice implementation and changes in load sources



What is your advice on the WQSAM Outcome? - Scope

Focus on TMDL

- Show ecosystem ends in conjunction with loads/trends, and changes in practice implementation and changes in load sources
- Having multiple outcomes focusing on implementation and changes in WQ is needed to address the lag time associated with restoration efforts
- Maintains accountability within the partnership
- Stay focused on TMDL. If want to broaden scope, create an additional new outcome

Broaden Scope

- Lacks alignment with goal language
- Monitoring includes lots of variables, not just N,P, S, DO
- Too limited focusing only on TMDL
- Include living resource responses
- We need multiple relevant lines of evidence (outputs) for our WQ goal.
- Analysis, evaluation, and investigation of all data-intensive Agreement outcomes, not just TMDL requirements
- Include human health responses – toxins, bacteria
- Interest in connecting it to conservation

Advice to MB: UPDATE



Questions to Consider

- Was there anything not captured in the previous feedback?
- What is critical to include in the scope of the outcome?