Status and Trends Workgroup Meeting

Tuesday, December 1, 2020
1:30 PM – 3:00 PM

Join by Webinar
Meeting Number: 120 011 3112 Password: <mark>STWG</mark>
Webinar*:
https://umces.webex.com/umces/j.php?MTID=m6f9353e0370a3430a41c75d20081c757

Or Join by Phone
Conference Line: +1-408-418-9388 Access Code: 120 011 3112

Meeting Materials:
https://www.chesapeakebay.net/what/event/status_and_trends_workgroup_december_2020
_meeting

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

Action Items
- ✓ Katheryn Barnhart will compile the Menti results on priorities for the workgroup and bring this topic back to the next meeting.
- ✓ Katheryn Barnhart will follow up with Justin Shapiro on the status of the Forage Fish Indicator Fish Habitat indicator.
- ✓ Katheryn Barnhart will meet with the Protected Lands indicator contacts to discuss how to communicate the methods in the A&M document.
- ✓ Katheryn Barnhart will reach out to the contacts for the Climate Resiliency Indicators around March to discuss communicating these indicators differently since these indicators will not see much change in one year.

AGENDA

1:30 Opening and Roll Call - Katheryn Barnhart, Coordinator

1:35 Indicators 101 – Peter Tango, STAR Co-coordinator
An overview of the Indicators framework, how indicators are updated using an Analysis and Methods Document and a data file, and what makes a good indicator.

Desired outcome: A better collective understanding of the indicators framework and indicators process and how they relate to this workgroup

Peter stated with a common definition of an indicator to give everyone common knowledge on it. It is defined as a summary measure that provides information on the

state of (i.e., status) or change in (i.e., trend), the system that is being measured. The online access to the Chesapeake Bay Program (CBP) indicators can be found at [Chesapeake Progress](). The CBP has different types of indicators which are influencing factors, outputs, and performance indicators. Influencing factors shows what are the key influencing factors impacting the achievement of an outcome. An output indicator show if a group is producing what is in their work plans and management strategies, and a performance indicator shows if a group is achieving the outcome.

Indicator Support at the CBP includes an Analysis and Methods (A&M) Document. This document is used as a reference for users that want to know how an indicator was developed. It is continuously updated and keeps track of the contacts, data sources, and methods for the indicator.

Peter than gave an example of Brook Trout indicators to show a direct measure approach, direct estimate approach, and an indirect estimate approach. There are multiple ways to approach an indicator which is dependent on what management and science questions they are trying to answer.

Renee Thompson asked for the Brook Trout examples if there has there been any analysis on comparing the results of the different approaches. Peter Tango stated the states said it is a large ask for data every year. The estimate approach has not been deployed yet. This approach was a discussion topic on what to do in between the current 5-year collection. Renee Thompson would like to work with Peter Tango on how to utilize the Healthy Watershed Assessment on developing indicators using the indicator framework. She mentioned a similar presentation to the one he just gave would be useful for her workgroup.

Scott Phillips asked once an indicator is updated what is the process of getting it onto Chesapeake Progress. Katheryn Barnhart stated once there is updated data for an indicator, the indicator contacts will update the data file and A&M file. It will then be sent to Katheryn Barnhart and her team to review it along with creating a communication strategy for the data. After review, the documents will be sent to Kaitlyn May. She updates the information on Chesapeake Progress. Scott Phillips asked this question because Chesapeake Progress also reflects what is in the Management Strategy concerning the factors influencing the outcome. Scott Phillips said they are finishing updating the Clean Water Cohort Strategy Review System documents. Doreen Vetter mentioned updating the Management Strategy and Logic & Action Plan may not be the same timeframe for when the indicators are updated. In general when the indicators are updated, this is the time her team updates the other information about the outcome on the website, but if there is significant content that needs to be changed, they can do it outside of the indicator update. Kaitlyn May can send the word text for particular sections to update. Scott Phillips said this is helpful because there will be major revisions for the Water Quality Standards Attainment and Monitoring (WQSAM) Outcome and the WIP2025 Outcome.

Scott Phillips also asked that for some outcomes there are not a quantitative outcome so it is not easy to have a performance indicator. Is it best to show what outputs were produced? Peter Tango said the demonstration of resources is good. Scott Phillips would like to work with the team on the Toxics Contaminants indicators because it is a list of resources from years ago.

Peter Tango also mentioned in some ways the WQSAM outcome is challenged there too as they are "Continually improve the capacity to monitor and assess the effects of management actions," which is kind of why he is trying to have a workshop solidifying capacity enhancements. Traditional monitoring data is declining but citizen science and nontraditional partner monitoring is increasing. If they document its use and inclusion in analysis, they can account for increased capacity. Until then, they are disparate and need to be knit together officially. He wants recommendations from the workshop to direct such official knitting or marrying of available data within an analysis need where they are otherwise saying resources are declining when they actually just aren't using a wealth of what is really available.

Scott Phillips said his point was really about another challenge to report on a non-numeric guided outcome. It might be fair to ask if having non-numeric outcomes waters down urgency and support for certain program support needs.

Julianna Greenberg asked where are the A&M documents? Katheryn Barnhart said it is on Chesapeake Progress right under the chart for an indicator. They are PDF versions so if it needs to be edited, she can send out a word document.

Renee stated that she has worked on updated the Protected Lands indicators for multiple years. She thought prior to Katheryn Barnhart taking over the Indicator Coordinator position that the indicator team was working on fixing the A&M document to make it more user friendly especially since the GIS indicators include tool boxes and codes. Doreen said they did an update to the A&M document to bring in the Adaptive Management section. One of things GIS related that they started to do is an audit of the different GIS maps on Chesapeake Progress because it is not uniform on what information is available for the maps. They have not been able to finish this task. Doreen mentioned the GIS update is not uniform, so they have a chance to change the process of updating those indicators. Renee Thompson also mentioned they might want to consider updating the accessibility and the format of the document because it is so large. She mentioned a HTML format so that users may jump to a certain section.

Julie Reichert-Nguyen mentioned that CRWG is faced with a similar issue of updating the A&M document. It is hard to answer the questions in the A&M document because climate change impacts will not largely be seen in just one year. Julie Reichert-Nguyen said it is currently a one size fits all for all the indicators, but it might be useful to make it fit to the indicator and what type of information they are trying to portray. Doreen said this sounds

like a good topic for the workplan in the future. Katheryn Barnhart agreed and said it sounds like two different topics with A&M customization and accessibility.

2:00 Discussion of Status and Trends Workplan – Katheryn Barnhart and Doreen Vetter
Following up on last meeting's action item, we will review the 2018 workplan, 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 2020/2021 workplan.

Desired outcome: A marked-up draft of items for the 2020/2021 Status and Trends workplan, to be later revised and presented back to the workgroup at the next meeting.

Katheryn Barnhart went over the Workgroup Mission which entails:
- Ensure the integrity of the Indicators Framework by focusing the development and use of information in the CBP with the principles described in the Framework.
- Foster cross-outcome collaboration among the Goal Implementation Teams (GITs) on identified information needed to track progress toward and adaptively mange achievement of goals and outcomes.
- Staff the indicators management process.

Katheryn Barnhart then asked the workgroup through mentimeter what should be the current priorities of the Status and Trends Workgroup. Results shown in this link.

Doreen Vetter mentioned each workgroup determines how the indicators are updated. The Coordinator should play an important role in guiding and transitioning any staffer work in updating the indicators.

Greg Allen said the Toxic Contaminant Indicators had extensive written documentation from the previous staffer, but it was difficult to use easily for the next update.

Scott Phillips told Katheryn Barnhart she can also use the STAR meetings to encourage cross-GIT discussion of selected indicators.

Katheryn Barnhart decided not to go into the presentation on the 2018 Workplan because she thinks it would be more beneficial to compile all of the Menti suggestions and group them into categories. At the next meeting, she will allow the workgroup members to vote on priority of these suggestions. This way she can dedicate more time to the workgroup suggestions and discussing what was in the 2018 Workplan at the next meeting.

2:40 Indicator Status Updates and Round Robin – Katheryn Barnhart and Outcome reps
Round Robin with Outcome representatives for feedback and updates on other indicator development work, including follow-up on outcome-related action items from the last meeting on November 2, 2020.

Justin Shapiro was unable to make the meeting so Katheryn Barnhart will follow up with him on the status of the Forage Fish Indicator.

Megan Ossmann said they had some data collection issues for developing a Black Duck and Wetland indicator. At the last Management Board (MB) meeting, the chairs of both those outcomes put in joint request for staff support or funding for a living resource data analyst contract to do data mining. The chairs are returning to January on this topic for an answer from the MB. They are hoping it would be a one or two year contract applicable to both the Black Duck and Wetland outcomes.

Julianna said they are still working to update the Stream Health indicator, and it will probably occur mid 2021. It is one of their biggest priorities for next year.

For the Brook Trout status, Julianna said they are waiting on the East Brook Trout Joint Venture 2020 metadata. She doesn't know when it will be available. She is meeting with the co-chairs of the Brook Trout Workgroup to talk about how to handle the data which will probably involve the contractor that Megan Ossmann discussed.

Katheryn Barnhart will reach out to Justin about the Fish Habitat indicator.

Hilary anticipating getting the Toxics Contaminants Policy and Prevention data sent out later in December. For the Toxics Contaminants Research indicator, Katheryn Barnhart is in discussion with Scott to find a more quantitative indicator since it is still in development.

The Land Use Options Evaluation indicator is similar to the Toxics Contaminants Research indicator because it is compiling resources and putting it on a website in order to meet the needs. They are not sure at what point they are done. They do not know how to measure this indicator. For the Land Use Methods and Metrics, Peter Claggett is working on this indicator, and they need the second year of high resolution data which will allow them to compare 2013 – 2017. The high resolution data will be available in 2021. They will have the data, but it is not necessarily an indicator. Also, the second part of the outcome is communication, but they also don't really know how to communicate it.

The Protected Lands indicator is expected to be updated in April 2021. They are implementing automated tools, but it will change how they will communicate it. Katheryn Barnhart said they can meet about how to communicate the methods in the A&M document.

The Healthy Watershed indicator is in development, and Peter Tango's presentation to the workgroup will help them with it.

Katheryn Barnhart will reach out to the contacts for the Climate Resiliency Indicators around March to discuss communicating these indicators differently since these indicators

will not see much change in one year. She can start thinking about how to restructure the A&M document for the climate indicators.

Renee asked who is part of the workgroup. Katheryn Barnhart stated that coordinators and staffers are members of the workgroup on an agenda driven basis. She values their participation in providing updates to their indicators, and especially in the early stages of the workgroup, their suggestions on driving the workplan for the future.

Actions from last meeting that still need to be discussed:

Related Outcome	Action
Tidal Wetlands	Need to consider if the piece from the NOAA Coastal Change Analysis Program should still be utilized for tidal wetlands on Chesapeake Progress. - Julie Reichert-Nguyen, group

2:55 Next steps and Actions – Katheryn Barnhart
Topics for the next meeting:
- Status and Trends Workplan
- Scheduling reoccurring meeting dates

Adjourn

Participants: Breck Sullivan, Peter Tango, Katheryn Barnhart, Doreen Vetter, Renee Thompson, Sally Claggett, Julie Reichert-Nguyen, Rachel Felver, Ivan Hernandez, Jeni Keisman, Julianna Greenberg, Megan Ossmann, Qian Zhang, Scott Phillips, Tuana Phillips, Garrett Stewart, Annabelle Harvey, Marisa Baldine, Kaitlyn May, Olivia Wisner, Greg Allen, Laura Cattell Noll