

Status and Trends Workgroup

MINUTES

October 11, 2016 from 1:00-3:00 PM

CBPO National Park Service Large Conference Room

Conference Line: 866-299-3188, access code 410-267-5731

Adobe Connect: <http://epawebconferencing.acms.com/stwg/>

1:00-1:10 pm Opening (Laura Free, 10 minutes)

- Welcome and introductions
- Review action items from last meeting:
 - Laura will talk to the GIS team about any available “schools” layer and the GIS watershed boundary overlay to determine a count of the total schools in the watershed. [Work still needs to be done on this action item.](#)
 - Laura will pull out specific action items from last meeting’s discussion regarding the role and responsibilities of the work group for the work plan. [Completed.](#)
 - Laura asked for feedback from members after two weeks (comments due October 6, request distributed September 19) [Completed.](#)
 - Laura will follow up with Howard regarding the GIS Lead Role with the workgroup. [Completed today.](#)
 - The Communications team will talk offline to come up with a few options to discuss updates and news with partners (ie- texts, internal newsletters simultaneous with public press releases). [Rachel Felver discussed how the communications team is handling internal communications within the partnership. Rachel has put together a list of options to focus on improving internal communications, such as: including internal newsletter for all Bay partnerships, working with staffers to do updates within the CBPO, working with coordinators and staffers of standard operating procedures \(media releases, etc\), enhancing brown bag lunch series, training for visual literacy as an extension of communications team.](#)

1:10-1:40 pm Update: Indicators Presentation at STAR Meeting (Laura Free, 30 minutes)

Description: Laura will share an update from the most recent STAR team meeting where she led a discussion on the role of the Status and Trends workgroup in developing indicators and in guiding the Chesapeake Bay Program to use indicator information in decision making.

Objective: to share with the workgroup STAR’s feedback on the role of the workgroup within the Program.

Laura reviewed for the group [presentations](#) that she and Peter Tango gave to the STAR meeting regarding examples of indicators to encourage creative thinking about indicator needs, as well as the Status and Trends workplan. STAR confirmed that the Status and Trends workgroup should ensure that the Indicator process works. Peter’s [presentation](#) can work as a guidance/ check list document of what to consider when working with indicators. STAR encouraged the Status and Trends workgroup to get involved in the process of developing indicators- to shepherd indicators through the process. STAR liked the idea of convening panels of experts to bring expertise to specific problems and then inviting those

experts to participate in the indicator-development process. Regarding the Biennial Review Process, STAR did not provide in-depth comment of the role of Status and Trends Workgroup in that process.

This meeting with STAR has been captured in the edits to the [workplan](#).

Kristin discussed how GIT 6 is going to be looking in depth at the Biennial Review on Oct. 18, it may be helpful to ask then what role STAR could play to flesh out their (and therefore Status and Trends) role within the review process. Kristen will bring this topic up at that GIT 6 meeting. Jennifer mentioned that this strategy review system will also be presented at the habitat goal team meeting in November. Kristin discussed how people reacted positively to this review being tied to the indicator process.

1:40-2:25pm Discussion: Draft Workplan (Laura Free, 45 minutes)

Description: The Coordinator will review a draft workplan, and workgroup members will discuss changes or additions. Staffer will make changes to workplan in meeting based on feedback.

Objective: to approve this draft workplan at the workgroup level, so that the Coordinator can present a draft workplan at STAR meeting on October 27.

See [workplan draft](#).

Laura reviewed the updates to this document, from the last meeting as well as the Sept. 19 draft.

A membership section was added to the workplan. Laura proposed that goal team coordinators and staffers would provide their input on specific agenda items as opposed to attending all meetings as general workgroup members. Any agenda items discussed in the Status and Trends meetings that require coordinator and staffer input could then be brought to staffer/coordinator meetings for feedback, or the Indicators Coordinator could request that coordinators and staffers attend an upcoming Status & Trends meeting.

Kristin discussed a concern of sectioning people off from discussion too soon, however, noting that many topics in this workgroup can involve multiple GITs. Laura responded that we could certainly discuss what we think is necessary, but she doesn't want to expect regular attendance from all coordinators and staffers. It is possible to have coordinator/staffer meetings quarterly to help maintain cross-GIT involvement. Jennifer suggested that Status and Trends topics could be linked to reporting to the Management board. Greg concurred that this could link up nicely to the biennial strategy review system. Jennifer agreed that it probably is premature to step back and have other staffers/coordinators to do so as well. Rachel wondered if some of this info could be conveyed at the coordinator staffer meetings in a consistent 10-15 min segment of the meeting.

After discussion, it was confirmed that coordinators/staffers WILL stay on as core members of the Status and Trends workgroup for now, while other ideas to have themed meetings or quarterly meeting, etc., may change this in the future.

Laura suggested that we look at holding a meeting to prepare for the biennial review process at the beginning of the year. Doreen added that this meeting was suggested if the coordinators were interested parties of the group, instead of core members, to help think about future agendas. Laura summarized that these Status & Trends meeting agendas should be organized strategically so as to maximize the time of the coordinators/staffers.

Catherine asked how GIT6 and the Status and Trends workgroup differ in their individual roles in guiding the development of this biennial review process and GITs preparing for it. Doreen and Greg replied that the indicators discussion is for the Status and Trends workgroup. GIT 6 has other components that they're supporting. GIT6 is the overall leader in the progress sessions of the review process, but Status and Trends will help with the indicators component of those sessions.

ACTION: Workgroup coordinator will work with GIT 6 to determine how Status & Trends meetings could help coordinators and staffers prepare for the biennial review.

Laura also reviewed the "nonmeasureable" outcomes and the structure for assessing action on these items. Catherine said that this has a direct relationship with Chesapeake Progress. Progress is tracked at the workplan level. All parts of the outcome are addressed on Progress. A report is provided for the nonmeasureable components. Catherine discussed that it is helpful that this group can review them, to make sure that groups don't forget these components of their outcomes.

Next was a discussion of STAC's role in the Status and Trends workplan. In the section of the workplan regarding "Formulate Prioritized List of Needed indicators"-

Kristin asked how this group would engage STAC? There are strong opinions on how parts of the agreement were drafted and that we did not follow a traditional adaptive management model. Therefore, this could lead to some unproductive discussions unless we make sure to think about engaging members of STAC specifically that may be a part of GIT 6 and STAR. Would this be a workshop with a focus on structured decision making to help work through this? Jennifer liked the idea of a small group of key STAC members, and she was wary of STAC workshop. Laura added that we can come back to this discussion at a later meeting.

Laura asked the group how to verbalized the role of Communications regarding "building the capacity of the Program to develop and maintain indicators" in the workplan. Catherine asked for clarification on what that means. Laura added that this group is not responsible for drawing up plans for indicators directly, but pulling information together to help with these plans. Rachel added that as integrators, communications does play a role in this process, not exactly as a constant tracker of progress. Rachel confirmed that these activities were captured in the workplan appropriately. "Building capacity" is more for STAR and STAC to help carry out.

What are the mechanisms that can be used to help address indicator-related priorities? Working with STAR, STAC? If there are other suggestions, please contact Laura Free.

The group agreed to approve this workplan to then move to STAR. It will be updated again the 4th quarter of 2017. Melissa and Laura can compile any additions to bring to the workgroup. As far as determining leads for activities, it was discussed to assign leads as we go, possibly a year at a time.

Greg suggested the group identify leads to hold parties accountable to get the job done. The group decided that more time was needed to determine the leads. These leads will not necessarily be needed for the STAR meeting when this workplan is presented, but will be compiled before the next Status and Trends meeting.

ACTION- Work plan will be cleaned up and then sent out to Status and Trends group for input on appropriate leads. Unassigned leads will be discussed at our next meeting.

2:25-2:30 pm Timeline Review (Laura Free, 5 minutes)

Description: This standing agenda item will confirm data updates completed in the last month and list data updates occurring within the next month.

Objective: to make members aware of completed and upcoming data updates so they can resolve timing conflicts or other issues offline with the Indicators Coordinator.

In Sept., the NPS loads and water quality standards attainment indicator update was completed. Wetlands numbers are being updated with Kyle Runion and the wetlands workgroup. Protected lands and the Striped Bass indicators are coming up- updated annually. The Bottom habitat indicator is still in review.

There might also be an update in Dec from the Diversity workgroup on their indicator.

2:30-2:45 pm Report Out of Action Items (Melissa Merritt, 15 minutes)

Adjourn (Next meeting scheduled for November 8 from 1-3 pm in NPS Large Conference Room.)

Action Item	Timeframe	Lead
Work plan will be cleaned up and then sent out to Status and Trends group for input on appropriate leads. Unassigned leads will be discussed at our next meeting.	Nov 2016	Laura, workgroup members
ACTION: Workgroup coordinator will work with GIT 6 to determine how Status & Trends meetings could help coordinators and staffers prepare for the biennial review.		Workgroup coordinators

Future Agenda Items

Topic	Timeframe	Lead
Diversity Indicator	November 8, 2016	Reggie Parrish
Develop guiding questions to assist GITs in developing indicators in each of the categories of the Indicator Framework	November 8, 2016	Laura Free
Exploring a Forage Fish Indicator	TBD	Bruce Vogt
How do key actions in the work plans relate to an indicator?	Spring 2017	Workgroup members

Participants

Kristin Saunders, Cross GIT Coordinator, ksaunders@ca.umces.edu
Catherine Krikstan, Chesapeake Stat Team, ckrikstan@chesapeakebay.net
Laura Free Indicators Coordinator, free.laura@epa.gov
Rachel Felver Communications Director, rfelver@chesapeakebay.net
Howard Weinberg, GIS Analyst, hweinber@chesapeakebay.net
Doreen Vetter, ChesapeakeStat Project Manager, vetter.doreen@epa.gov
Greg Allen, Toxic Contaminates, allen.greg@epa.gov
Jennifer Greiner, Vital Habitats/GIT2, jennifer_greiner@fws.gov
Kara Skipper, kara.skipper@noaa.gov
John Wirts, WV State Monitoring Program Manager, John.C.Wirts@wv.gov