Envisioned Evolution of STAR

Outline

- GIT Survey Answers
- STAR Response to Survey Answers
- Changes to the Evolution of STAR document
- Next Steps
- Discussion

What are the reasons collaboration between the GIT and STAR was not effective previously?

Ineffective Collaboration because…

- CBP focus on TMDL implementation did not align with diverse GIT objectives.
- GITs and STAR have been focused on the identity and growth of their individual groups since the new CBP organization in 2010.
- Previously data collection and analysis occurred through existing GIT staff, with no direct need for STAR support.
- STAR operations focused on restoration and water quality related goals; GIT operations focused on protection and conservation.
- We got away from the structured interaction during STAR meetings where each GIT discussed ongoing activities.
- Staff capacity/need for technical liaison

Improvements that could be made to facilitate better collaboration and communication between the GIT and STAR?

Possible Improvements

- The proposed ecosystem emphasis of a reorganized STAR.
- STAR and GITs continue to reach out through liaisons and engage each other through specific questions, discussion topics and needs.
- Identification of collaborative projects would facilitate increased communication between the GIT and STAR.
  - Develop a process to determine collaboration potential across the GITS.
- If a GIT/WG identifies specific scientific or technical needs, STAR would be available to help identify and develop those needs.
  - Process Recommendation: A semi-formal "request for Scientific and Technical needs"
  - STAR would then evaluate and report back to the GIT on feasibility/resource support available.
- Clarification of STAR's role and how it differs from STAC.
- The GITs would benefit from a better understanding of the scope of STAR and its capacity to fulfill GIT needs.
- Data stewards or custodians here on campus to coordinate data inputs toward reporting indicators from dispersed partners (Joint Ventures, State and local agencies)
- Give STAR a formal review role for management strategies.
  - Emphasize ensuring that valid and reliable metrics are used in developing and tracking progress on management strategies.

What is the GIT's opinion on what STAR's major role should be within the GIT?

STAR's Role within the GIT

- Helping to develop decision-support tools that can link multiple outcomes and data sets to build collaboration across GITs and promote an ecosystem perspective.
- GITs will engage with STAR to get input on monitoring needs, data collection, and indicator development for the Bay Agreement management strategies.
- The revised purpose of STAR articulates how they could play a major role in WQ - supporting monitoring efforts, update status and trends information, expand modeling tools to understand ecosystem response.
- STAR serves as a clearinghouse for information and resources related to data and provides data needs when they are readily available.
- STAR could serve as a sounding board and partner in filling data gaps.
- Give STAR a formal review role for management strategies.
- Data stewards or custodians here on campus to coordinate data inputs toward reporting indicators from dispersed partners (Joint Ventures, State and local agencies)
- Overall science review role.
  - e.g., STAC recently claimed that the numeric targets in proposed GIT outcomes had weak scientific basis. We should know that there is a strong basis for such numeric targets based partly on STAR review and concurrence.

Would the GIT be willing to commit to setting up one seminar discussion per year?

GIT Identified Seminar

- **Yes!**
  - If guidance is provided.
  - If seminars could be focused on action or product development rather than just information exchange.

Other Comments

- The GITs all identified liaisons.
- Fisheries GIT is excited to see the direction that STAR is moving and appreciate the opportunity to weigh in on the reorganization plan.
- Need a better understand the difference between STAR's role and responsibilities and those of STAC.
- STAR seminars may be more effective with all GIT leadership, including workgroup chairs in participation.
- When the BMP verification framework is in place, there may be a role for STAR in assisting the states' BMP verification and validation efforts, perhaps through providing statistical sampling, survey design, or other expertise/guidance.
- STAR needs to be clear about the scientific role it can perform.
- Monthly STAR meetings too frequent, suggest quarterly instead

STAR Response

- Updated document based on GIT Reponses

Scientific, Technical Assessment, and Report (STAR) team

Revising Science Support Activities for the Chesapeake Bay Program Partnership

(Updated April 22~~draft March 11th~~, 2014)

Need: The new Chesapeake Bay Agreement will require additional monitoring, modeling, and analysis to help decision makers effectively achieve goals and associated outcomes. CBP science activities are coordinated through the **Scientific, Technical Assessment, and Report (STAR) team**. Over the past several years, STAR had a heavy emphasis on water-quality activities as the partners implemented the Bay TMDL. STAR was not able to fully carry out its revised purpose (prepared in 2011 and approved by Management Board) to *"facilitate with science partners to have increased capacity to serve the priority science needs of the GITs, using an adaptive-management framework, and summarize key information for the CBP partners. STAR will help coordinate the modeling, monitoring, indicator, and information management activities needed by the GITs and work with CBP science partners to synthesize information for cross-cutting CBP products (such as the Bay Barometer)"* To address the needs of the new Bay Agreement, STAR is evolving to have more of an ecosystem-based science mission.

Proposed Revision of Purpose and Functions for STAR

Purpose: *Coordinate monitoring, modeling, and analysis needed to update, explain, and communicate ecosystem condition and change to support decision making to achieve CBP goals and outcomes*

STAR vs. STAC

- STAR is the internal science provider.
  - Functions of STAR are listed in the provided document: "Revising Science Support Activities for the Chesapeake Bay Program Partnership".
- STAC serves as the external advisor.
  - Provides scientific and technical review of data sources, methodologies, and merit reviews.
  - Serves as an independent, external source of scientific and technical counsel for the restoration effort.
  - Advises on the uncertainty associated with all portions of the adaptive management enterprise.
  - Identifies emerging challenges to the restoration effort.
  - Serves to assess whether the CBP is effectively implementing an adaptive management ecosystem-based approach.
- There will necessarily be some overlap in the activities of STAR and STAC while they each fulfill their respective missions.

Next Steps

- Approval of the document "Revising Science Support Activities for the Chesapeake Bay Program Partnership".

- Implementation of the new STAR structure and purpose.

THANK YOU TO ALL OF THE GITS!

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION