



Status and Trends Workgroup Meeting

Monday, January 11, 2021

1:00 PM – 3:00 PM

Join by Webinar

Meeting Number: 120 011 3112 Password: **STWG**

Webinar*: <https://umces.webex.com/umces/j.php?MTID=mcbbbebed6a59fc6b37da62186b9b80d8>

Or Join by Phone

Conference Line: +1-408-418-9388 Access Code: 120 009 2390

Meeting Materials:

https://www.chesapeakebay.net/what/event/status_and_trends_workgroup_january_2021_meeting

This meeting will be recorded for internal use to assure the accuracy of meeting notes.

AGENDA

1:00 Opening and Roll Call - Katheryn Barnhart, Coordinator

1:10 [Discussion of Status and Trends Workplan](#) – Katheryn

Following up on last meeting's action item, we will review the [list of priorities](#) from the menti results of the December meeting and discuss if any changes need to be made to the items on this list. We will then review the 2018 workplan (in presentation format), with recommended adjustments based upon actions that have occurred since it was last updated as well as any updates to CBP priorities in this time. We will then discuss these adjustments and any recommendations for drafting an updated 2021 workplan.

Desired outcome: A revised list of items to be later added to a 2021 workplan.

Katheryn grouped the suggestions from the last meeting into different categories. The categories included the following:

- Communication of indicator process/SOPs and process maintenance
- Streamlining indicator process
- Indicator development
- Inter-outcome coop
- Factor influencing indicators
- Misc.

Communication of Indicator process/SOPs and process maintenance

Katheryn went through each item in the categories to receive comments and feedback on them and converting them into actionable items to implement into the workplan.

For item "A", Peter Tango suggested providing an example and walking through with the workgroup on how an indicator is developed. This will help members understand what type of

commitment and work goes into it. Katheryn Barnhart commented that it is not a one fits all situation, but she will add it as an agenda item.

Julie Reichert-Nguyen commented for item “C” that the Climate Resiliency Workgroup (CRWG) needs to decide if they should use their capacity to maintain their current indicators or develop new ones that the program has identified as important. The workgroup has partnered with other organizations such as EPA to help maintain their indicators which requires a lot of coordination and they are still having a capacity issue. If there was additional staffing from the Status and Trends Workgroup or STAR, the workgroup could do more with their indicators, but if not, the workgroup will need to narrow down their list of indicators. Peter Tango said that when the workgroup gets to the point of removing indicators to bring it up to STAR in case other organizations or GITs can help.

Breck Sullivan noted that the staffer for STAR, Status and Trends Workgroup, and Climate Resiliency Workgroup (CRWG) are all the same person, so the need for additional support is outside the role of the staffer.

Doreen Vetter asked for clarification on the set indicator schedule, item “D”. She said in general it is dependable on when the data is available. Julianna Greenberg said it would be helpful to know when they are expected to update an indicator. Rachel Felver commented it would be nice to anticipate when indicators are updated, and she understands that is why this group is building up again. Kristin Saunders stated the original SRS schedule was set as closely linked to when indicators would be updating their information. It was not perfect, but it was an attempt to align them. Katheryn Barnhart said there is an internal calendar that was built by the previous coordinator so she can share it with the group.

Peter Tango commented a couple of schedules they have used in the past were focused around a Bay Barometer release at a specific time. Alternatively, recognizing different indicators have different collection-processing-analysis-and-reporting schedules has led to an approach that rolls out indicators as they are updated. Solidifying schedule of availability in either case will be helpful.

The next item “E” Katheryn discussed is describing the roles of coordinators and staffers when developing and updating an indicator. Katheryn asked if there was a knowledge gap of who can be a part of the indicator development and what their role is in the development. Peter Tango was wondering if this item was about the scientific development of an indicator and people not knowing what it entails besides coordinating groups and meetings. Doreen Vetter said “E” is about two pieces – developing and updating. She said where she is seeing gaps are variability on each workgroup for who is responsible for updating the indicator. If it is permanent position, she is seeing the most consistency of updating the work. They see gaps in processing when the work is given to the staffer because they must train themselves and are consistently replaced. It would be helpful for a permanent staff to lead the indicator work and train the staffer once they are on board. Doreen said they need better documentation for transitions, but they also need to consider restructuring who takes the lead on indicators.

For item “F”, Katheryn Barnhart asked for more clarification. Peter Tango stated it is important to make sure there is continual monitoring funding and not just data for the first year of data. Peter Tango also commented that people should look at what monitoring is already in place and already has committed funding to use for an indicator instead of creating new monitoring. Julie Reichert-

Nguyen said this is a really good point especially for climate indicators because these indicators require at least 30 years of data. The CRWG has been talking with other workgroups about sentinel sites if they want it to be considered an indicator for climate.

For item “G”, Katheryn Barnhart asked if there are any suggestions on specific actions to help groups that are updating their methods. Peter Tango provided examples of different form of changes such as when the Black Duck indicator switched from population to habitat based, and the SAV is switching from ariel images to satellite images. Breck Sullivan commented a situation occurred with the CRWG where the organization providing the data was no longer updating it. The CRWG needed to find someone else to provide the data so it would be helpful for this workgroup to serve as a space to discuss other options for data. Katheryn agreed that she could be a point of contact for when these issues arise and can bring it forward to the group. Peter Tango suggested the CRWG follow up with him to learn about other data.

Item H states to continue working with the Communication Team and other relevant teams to communicate indicator results/progress. Kristin Saunders stated at the last GIT Chairs meeting they talked about their understanding or lack of understanding about how far the program is from reaching different goals in the Watershed Agreement. They discussed if they should be more transparent about that information. They did not come up with a solution, but they did suggest providing an over view or update at each Management Board meeting. She said one audience that is important in terms of communication is the Management Board who may not go into Chesapeake Progress. The group should consider how to intentionally put this information in front of decision makers because it may help getting more investment in monitoring or more robust support in managing the data. Doreen Vetter stated the Management Board receives updates on indicators in their monthly update package before every meeting. She suggested they could make it more intentional by also giving the update at the end of the Management Board meeting during the communication section. Kristin Saunders suggested making it an individual agenda item for the Management Board meetings so that they can talk about big picture progress and not just individual indicators.

Streamlining Indicator Process

Peter Tango commented the CRWG was able to come up with 200 indicators but was able to narrow it down to indicators that would help inform decision-making. The STWG can work together with the other workgroups establishing priorities for creating an indicator which would help with item “A.”

Katheryn Barnhart mentioned the item “B” for utilizing current CBP work when considering different indicators would also fit in with the Indicator Development category. They can focus on work already being done and where work is already being allocated when developing or updating an indicator.

Item “C” was also discussed earlier in terms of focusing on who is the audience for the communication of indicator progress, serving as a point of contact to disseminate requests for data or support, and providing notices on when data needs to be updated.

Indicator Development

Katheryn Barnhart asked the workgroup if they had any ideas for item “A” to help them complete the goal of developing an indicator. There were no comments from the workgroup so she will bring this forward at future meetings.

There were specific suggestions from item “B” to create trending indicators for PCBs and Hg.

Item “C” highlights the need for the workgroup to work with the GITs throughout the entire process of planning, creating, and implementing an indicator.

Katheryn Barnhart asked for more clarification on item “D.” Rachel Felver said she submitted this item to remind the workgroup to consider utilizing these already developed frameworks when considering developing a new indicator. Breck Sullivan stated this is a nice reminder to utilize the framework to pinpoint science needs that may need an indicator or a need that needs continued data support for an indicator. Doreen Vetter considered using the new Science Need database to search science needs that may lead to an indicator or in need of an indicator. She wondered if the database could add a feature to flag for these science needs.

For item “E” and “F” Katheryn Barnhart and Kaitlyn May are putting together a presentation for the Biennial meeting on it. They will ask members at this meeting and at future STWG meetings on other ideas to address this item.

Inter-outcome Cooperation

Katheryn Barnhart viewed item “A” of working with GITs to identify common factors among outcomes and shared challenges/solutions related to indicators as an opportunity to build off established resources among GITs.

Katheryn Barnhart commented the CRWG is working on item “B” for identifying outcome opportunities among GITs. Julie commented Chesapeake Progress is set up to be specific to outcomes, but she was wondering if there was a way to build a story on how the indicators among different GITs are connected. Katheryn said a goal for this year is to look over Chesapeake Progress and how they can connect the outcomes more. Rachel Felver stated Kaitlyn and Katheryn might be interested in the presentation their previous roles gave in the first Biennial Meeting. Doreen Vetter mentioned the connection between indicators could be on the “Influencing Factors” page, but they would need to put more thought into how to show the story of the indicators.

Katheryn Barnhart asked Julie Reichert-Nguyen to comment on item “C”. The CRWG is working with the Modeling Workgroup which is creating climate change projections. The current CRWG indicators are on past trends, but it would be nice to include projections and connect them to the trends they are seeing in the past. Kristin Saunders stated a lot of people have asked about predictive modeling for things beyond water quality especially for living resources. Katheryn said she would need to look into how they could incorporate those projections, but she will look more into that suggestion. Doreen Vetter said it would be a good STAR meeting discussion. Kristin Saunders stated it would be useful to layout the items in these categories and the work it will involve that lends to looking for support outside of STWG. A barrier is the STWG can only accomplish so much, but the Modeling Workgroup and Land Use Workgroup along with others can support accomplish some of the STWG workplan items.

Factor Influencing Indicators

Julie Reichert-Nguyen asked for an example of a factor influencing indicators for item “A”. Katheryn Barnhart stated influencing factors include environmental processes that might affect the outcomes measured. Carin stated there may be others that are not outcome related since some outcomes have a numerical target while others are more broad outcomes. Doreen Vetter said her team is trying to add visuals to the “Influencing Factors” page. They are trying to build out this content more intentionally. Julie mentioned there might be a way to pilot this work with the potential STAC workshop on Water Temperature. There are a lot of workgroups interested in this topic, and there is an item on it to build a Bay-wide Water Temperature indicator. This could be a way to map out the factors influencing indicators. Doreen Vetter mentioned this workgroup submitted a STAC workshop proposal on factors, but they had to drop it due to capacity issues. It would be good to compare the two proposals. Julie stated her STAC proposal goes beyond indicators to include assessment on BMPs, but the Bay Water Temperature indicator is an important item for multiple groups.

Misc.

Katheryn Barnhart noted the last item “A” is more related to adaptive management. The SRS planning team is working with individual GITs to streamline efforts through adaptive management, and she thinks this workgroup could help with that effort. This might also relate to bringing up the needs to the other STAR workgroups.

Katheryn will review the comments and recommendations from today to assess how best this workgroup can assist with the needs of the GITs in terms of indicators. She will not go over the 2018 Workplan during this meeting due to time constraints. She hopes to go over it and start editing it during the next meeting.

2:40 [Indicator Status Updates and Round Robin](#) – Katheryn and Outcome reps

Round Robin with Outcome representatives for feedback and updates on other indicator development work since the last meeting on December 1, 2020. We will also discuss potential changes to this update format such as a monthly indicator updates email (similar to Management Board program updates).

Katheryn Barnhart asked if her approach for these indicator updates worked for the members or if they had other suggestions. She was also considering framing it like the Management Board Indicator Updates which is done over email. Julianna Greenberg liked the idea of communicating over email before the meeting.

For the Black Duck indicator, the habitat GIT has submitted a proposal for a Living Resource Management position. It will be discussed at the next Management Board meeting.

Julianna Greenberg doesn't have any updates for the Stream Health indicator. The update will probably be closer to mid 2021.

For the Water Quality Standards Attainment and Monitoring Outcome, here is the status update:

1. Last fall, with DO, Chla, and preliminary SAV data, Qian Zhang has completed the preliminary assessment.
2. Two weeks ago, as the SAV data became final, he has completed an update of the assessment and the results are close to be shared.
3. He has also updated the A&M document based on the updated assessment.

However, Qian Zhang still needs to talk to Peter Tango to confirm:

1. If there is any water clarity data that we should expect from MD?
2. How should they deal with two segments that had changes in terms of whether they were assessed.

Katheryn Barnhart will follow up with Renee Thompson and Peter Claggett on the Land Use Methods and Metrics Indicator.

2:55 Next steps and Actions – Katheryn

We will also discuss, based upon workplan item discussion, what a regular meeting time/frequency for this group should be.

Katheryn Barnhart asked the workgroup how often they would like to meet and when is the best time. The consensus was meeting every other month on the second Monday of the month during the afternoon (March 8, 2021).

Adjourn

Participants: Katheryn Barnhart, Doreen Vetter, Breck Sullivan, Peter Tango, Kristin Saunders, Garrett Stewart, Julianna Greenberg, Marisa Baldine, Lee McDonnell, Megan Ossmann, Rachel Felter, Nora Jackson, Julie Reichert-Nguyen, Kaitlyn May, Justin Shapiro, Angie Wei, Carin Bisland