Scientific, Technical Assessment and Reporting (STAR) Team Meeting
10:00AM – 1:30PM April 24th, 2014
http://www.chesapeakebay.net/S=0/calendar/event/21547/

NEXT MEETING

May 2014 STAR Meeting
Date: May 22nd, 2014
Time: 10:00AM – 1:00PM
Location: Joe Macknis Memorial Conference Room (Fishshack) CBPO
Conference Line: 1-866-299-3188 code 410-267-5731
Adobe Connect: https://epa.connectsolutions.com/star2 (enter as guest)
Event webpage: http://www.chesapeakebay.net/S=0/calendar/event/21548/

MINUTES

Welcome, Introduction, Updates, and Announcements – William Dennison (STAR Chair), Mark Bennett (STAR Vice Chair), Peter Tango (STAR Coordinator)

STAR Leadership gave an introduction and request updates from the Goal Implementation Teams (GITs).

- National Water Quality Monitoring Council Conference, April 28th – May 2nd, 2014
- IAN UMCES Course in Communicating Science Effectively: May 12 – 14th, 2014 Horn Point Laboratory
- Chesapeake Modeling Symposium – Annapolis, MD May 28th – 29th, 2014
- Conference on Ecological and Ecosystem Restoration – New Orleans, Louisiana July 28th – August 1st, 2014
- Restore America's Estuaries 7th National Summit – Washington, D.C. November 1st – 6th, 2014
- Conowingo Panel and Public Hearing
    - Date: Monday April 28th, 2014 10AM – 12PM
    - Location: Conowingo Dam Visitor Center

Communications Discussion – All

STAR members discussed communication ideas including upcoming reports, studies, and videos to recommend to the Communications Workgroup.

Discussion

Indicators:
- Recently updated: Nitrogen, phosphorus, and sediment loads to the Bay for water year 2013.
- May update: Water Quality Standards Indicator.
- Fisheries indicator updates will be presented to the Management Board before released.

Envisioned Evolution of STAR – Bill Dennison and Mark Bennett
Attachment A – Presentation
Attachment B – "Revising Science Support Activities for the Chesapeake Bay Program Partnership"

STAR Leadership updated members on the envisioned evolution of STAR and request feedback. The discussion began with an overview of the GIT's perceptions of STAR, acquired through a survey sent to all GITs. STAR provided clarifying information on the purpose of STAR. STAR also provided an

overview of the changes made to the "Evolution of STAR" document based on the feedback from the GITs and STAR members.

Discussion

- It was suggested that there also be a liaison from STAR to GITs, instead of just GITs to STAR.
    - Need a GIT Liaison to inform the STAR Liaison when they are needed at the meetings.
    - The GITs should include STAR leadership in the Quarterly GIT Collaboration Meetings.
    - **ACTION**: Amanda Pruzinsky will send out email requesting schedules of GIT meetings and confirm the liaisons.

Possible roles of STAR:

- STAR could help identify science/data providers to help GITs with particular issues
- Data Coordination
- Cross GIT Collaboration
- Review of the management strategies

- **ACTION:** STAR will provide guidance to the GITs on the STAR Seminars and how to facilitate action or product development rather than just information exchange.
    - What roles could STAR and the GITs have in this topic issue?
    - What other science and data providers are available?

- Seminar suggestions by the GITs:
    - May – Bruce Vogt: Oyster Restoration
    - June – Brook Trout Prelim Model Output

- Meeting Schedule:
    - Decided on more frequent short meetings instead of two-day quarterly meetings.
    - Will continue to request updates and communications suggestions.

- STAR vs. STAC
    - Need requests: Both STAC and STAR are asking about the needs of the GITs. STAR and STAC should work together to develop questions and requests for the GITs.
    - Adaptive management cycle – Provide a written narrative and place STAC and STAR in a visual graphic to show how STAC and STAR would interact with the GITs.
        - Include specific examples, STAC Workshop to develop recommendation and then would help STAR respond and carry out the recommendations. Must answer the question: What things are doable within the existing resources?
        - STAR is not the reviewer, but rather a facilitator group.
            - For example, if STAC provides a list of recommendations for an issue, then STAR can use that list to respond with the feasibility and priorities.

- STAR will revise the document "Revising Science Support Activities for the Chesapeake Bay Program Partnership" based on the meeting discussions and bring it back to the group at the next meeting.

Identified Data and Monitoring Needs of the Bay Program – Amanda Pruzinsky
Attachment C

The discussion began with an overview of the current and possible future data and monitoring efforts and needs of the GITs and STAR, acquired through a survey sent to all GITs. STAR will incorporate this information into Phase III of BASIN.

Discussion

- **ACTION**: Add to the presentation and excel spreadsheet to incorporate the needs specific to Chesapeake Bay Agreement goals and outcomes and the needs that STAC has recommended.

- **ACTION**: Data Outcome – GIS data product with all of the data shown.

Fisheries

- Oysters: NOAA is working to conduct a full oyster stock assessment. Additional analyses are needed and have been proposed for approval. Bay wide population and biological reference points are part of the stock assessment.

Habitat

- Black Duck: Black Duck is a wetland tidal marsh dependant and submerged understand vegetation (SAV) dependant species – The research is trying to determine the acres of marsh habitat to support the winter population. Chesapeake Bay modeling and mapping of where black duck habitat is currently. Sea level rise impacts on black duck habitat.

- Stream Health: Baseline needs to be reassessed. The GIT would also like the Stream Health Outcome to expand to include stream bank stability and flood plain conductivity. There is an upcoming STAC Workshops on this issue, Restoring Sustainable Stream Projects in the Chesapeake and another workshop has been funded on flood plain conductivity (Re-Pluming the Chesapeake), which will both hopefully produce recommendations in the reports.

- Stream Miles for Fish Passage: There isn't currently monitoring for the effectiveness of opening the stream miles. The management strategy will include monitoring 50% of projects (targeting needs).

Water Quality

- Include the "Attainment of Water Quality Standards" and other water quality data sets in both the STAR and Water Quality GIT.

Healthy Watersheds

- The new needs of the Healthy Watersheds GIT seem fit for a STAC workshop.

Tidal and Non-tidal

- The data should be more specific about how many stations collect the different parameters.

Building and Sustaining Integrated Networks (BASIN) Overview and Update – Lea Rubin and Peter Tango
Attachment D
BASIN website

STAR Leadership provided an update on the progress and next steps of Building and Sustaining Integrated Networks (BASIN).

Discussion

- A comment on the inflationary pressures: Peter Tango reviewed economic studies on inflationary pressures and also that there has been a constant 3.24% annual inflation cost. This is something that STAR could look into including in the budgeting discussions.

- STAC recommended that monitoring for attainment needs to swift to monitoring for adaptive management and the integration of citizen science needs to occur. Should ask STAC if there is a different way to look at citizen science/non-traditional partners to help support the adaptive management monitoring.

- The incorporation of citizen science would also help with the stewardship goal to engage the community. The Stewardship GIT should be a part of this conversation.

- Comparing the costs of on-going Citizen Science Programs from other regions and the Chesapeake region.
    - Anna Mathis – Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay Virginia Office spoke at the last LGAC meeting and would have information on this issue.

Customer Expectations for the CBP Monitoring Networks – Bill Dennison
Attachment E

The purpose of the Customer Expectations portion of BASIN Phase II is to gain feedback on the usefulness of the products derived from the CBP monitoring networks. STAR provided the anticipated next steps of the "Customer Expectations" portion of BASIN Phase II.

Discussion

- **ACTION**: STAR Leadership will devise a draft Customer Expectations survey and present it at the next STAR Meeting for review and feedback.

- This was Nita Sylvester's last STAR Meeting before she retired. STAR thanked Nita for her effort and gave her an acronym: NITA – Notable Invaluable Tireless Analyst.

A holistic coastal assessment and reporting framework balances economic, societal, and environmental interests – Dr. Heath Kelsey, Program Director/Associate Research Scientist at University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science
Attachment F

Coastal and estuarine waters are some of the most productive and important ecosystems on earth, providing critical food, employment, transportation, and recreation resources. Each of these resource interests may have competing goals and objectives that have importance for local, regional, and global populations. Balancing these potentially competing interests is challenging, and has relied on piecemeal assemblages of separate assessments with the unique perspectives of each sector. Effective management of resources and ecosystems in this context requires a new approach to assessment that balances values from economic, societal, and environmental sectors, and reports on causes, status and trends, and management progress. This approach to communicating progress toward multiple objective achievement can provide a holistic assessment useful for large system management.

The University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science has pioneered the use of ecosystem health report cards as synthetic tools to assess and communicate ecosystem health status. These ecosystem health report cards are evolving to include components that assess pressure, state, and response indicators, as well as indicators that are relevant to societal and economic sectors. We are developing these new

assessment and reporting tools in several large and globally significant systems. The work to date suggests that a new assessment and reporting framework is possible to communicate the pressure, state, and management response from a multi-sectoral approach. We propose an approach to customizing this framework, and illustrate with current report card development projects for Chesapeake Bay, the Great Barrier Reef, and the Mississippi River Basin.

Authors: R. H. Kelsey; W. C. Dennison; E. C. Wicks; J. E. Thomas; S. D. Costanzo

Discussion

- The challenges with collecting data from 31 states:
  - County level data is next to impossible to collect.
  - Some national data sets that are collecting data from the states are being utilized.
  - Interns are connecting with state agencies individually to collect other data.
  - Need to continuously search for other sources and innovative ways to receive data.

- Input during the workshop through technology (smart phone, iPad, etc.).
  - The use of technology is timely.
  - Input data is received from all participates.
  - Starts the conversation and allows time to begin the detailed work.
  - Participants must understand that it is not a completely democratic process. Recommendations will be reviewed, synthesized, and prioritized.

- Used the first day of the workshop to "vent" and the next days to work on the issues and produce a draft product.

- The Report Card can be used to inform the regulatory process, but it is not designed as a regulatory management tool.

- Unexpected results of the workshop:
  - Participants were determined to figure out what the correct indicators are even if they aren't directly affecting their stake-holder group. Participants liked the process and wanted the results.
  - The Upper Mississippi participants were aware and interested in how it would affect the Gulf of Mexico.
  - High acceptation of an ecosystem approach.
  - High level steering committee and participation from the NGOs.

- Could review incorporating some ideas of the Mississippi River Basin Report Card to the Chesapeake Bay Program process such as:
  - Socioeconomic issues
  - Expanding the partnership to include non-traditional partners (NGOs)

PARTICIPANTS

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation	Email
Dennison	Bill	UMCES/STAR Chair	dennison@umces.edu
Bennett	Mark	USGS/STAR Vice Chair	mrbennet@usgs.gov
Tango	Peter	USGS/CBPO/STAR Coordinator	ptango@chesapeakebay.net
Pruzinsky	Amanda	CRC/CBPO/STAR Staffer	apruzinsky@chesapeakebay.net
Rubin	Lea	CRC/CBPO/STAR Staffer	lrubin@chesapeakebay.net

Brosch	Chris	VA Tech	broschc@vt.edu
Franke	Emily	CRC/Fisheries Staffer	emilie.franke@noaa.gov
Gattis	Mary	LGAC Coordinator	mgattis@allianceforthebay.org
Giese	Emma	WQGIT	egiese@chesapeakebay.net
Greiner	Jennifer	USFWS/CBPO	jennifer_greiner@fws.gov
Ingram	LJ	CHART-LLC	ljingram@chart-llc.net
Keisman	Jennifer	USGS/CBPO	jkeisman@usgs.gov
Kelsey	Heath	UMCES	hkelsey@umces.edu
Ley	Mary Ellen	USGS/CBPO	mley@chesapeakebay.net
Mallonee	Mike	ICPRB	mmallone@chesapeakebay.net
Michael	Bruce	MDNR	bmichael@dnr.state.md.us
Phillips	Scott	USGS	swphilli@usgs.gov
Phillips	Tuana	CRC/CBPO	Phillips.Tuana@epa.gov
Schwaab	Alexandra	UMCES	aschwaab@umces.edu
Shenk	Gary	EPA/CBPO	shenk.gary@epa.gov
Sylvester	Nita	EPA/CBPO	sylvester.nita@epa.gov
Thompson	Renee	USGS/CBPO	rthompson@chesapeakebay.net
Vetter	Doreen	EPA	vetter.doreen@epa.gov
Vogt	Bruce	NOAA	Bruce.Vogt@noaa.gov
Wolf	John	USGS/CBPO	jwolf@chesapeakebay.net