



Status and Trends Workgroup (STWG) Meeting

Wednesday, July 11, 2022

1:00 PM – 2:00 PM

Meeting Materials: [Link](#)

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

ACTION ITEMS

- Alex Gunnerson will send an email asking if anyone has topics they would like to cover in August in addition to the suggested topic of the new TMDL indicator.
- Alison Santoro will let Katheryn Barnhart know when the Stream Health Indicator is ready to be updated on ChesapeakeProgress.
- Katheryn Barnhart will reach out to Mary Andrews in September to check on the status of the Fish Passage indicator being ready for updates.
- Katheryn Barnhart will check in with Katie Brownson in October about the readiness of the Forest Buffer indicator for updating with 2021 data.
- Jamileh Soueidan will send the Analysis and Methods document and the data from Mike Kolian to Katheryn Barnhart at the end of July for the updates to the Climate Resiliency indicators.
- Katheryn Barnhart will follow up over email to Peter Tango and Qian Zhang about which meeting would be best for the new Water Quality Standards Attainment and Monitoring (WQSAM) Outcome indicator should be presented, in addition to an individual meeting about the potential timeline if Peter and Qian feel that is necessary.
- Peter Tango will send Katheryn Barnhart an email with more information on the USGS specific Chesapeake Bay Status and Trends group.
- Alex Gunnerson will invite Kelly Maloney and Sam Austin to the STWG meeting where the WQSAM indicator is being discussed.

Meeting Minutes

1:00 Opening and Roll Call, Announcements – Katheryn Barnhart, Coordinator

- Confirmation of new names for focus area themed meetings (see email from Alex Gunnerson on June 23rd).

Summary

At a previous meeting, it was suggested that new names be assigned to the first two types of indicator focus areas outlined on the [Status and Trends Workgroup Focus Area Document](#). Given the wide variety of positions and needs for outcomes, Katheryn, Alex Gunnerson, and Caroline Donovan suggested the following changes to more accurately portray the groups: "Qualitative Outcome Progress Tracking and Indicator Development" be changed to "Developing Indicators Group 1" and "Quantitative Outcome Indicator Development" be

changed to "Developing Indicators Group 2." There were no objections to this change. Kristin Saunders commented she likes the new structure of meetings for STWG and likes the new suggested names for the focus area groups.

Katheryn commented that since the outcomes scheduled to meet in August for indicator refinement need some more time before they are ready for a discussion, she is considering canceling the August meeting. If anyone has topics they would like to cover in August, they should email Katheryn (barnhart.katheryn@epa.gov) and Alex Gunnerson (agunnerson@chesapeakebay.net) so they can plan accordingly.

1:10 Indicator Update Run-through and Discussion – Katheryn Barnhart, Coordinator

Katheryn gave a [brief overview/reminder of the indicator update process timeline](#) and requirements before moving to address the questions listed below. More in depth information on this topic can be found in the [indicator process document](#) on the STWG webpage.

Katlyn Fuentes asked what the acronym A&M represents. Katheryn explained it stands for Analysis and Methods document, which is required for updating an indicator. Katheryn added the Analysis and Methods document contains various sections which contain information on how the data for the indicator were collected, the contacts for the data, and discussions on current trends and data that connect to outcome attainability and recent progress. The document is designed to provide the information needed for communicating the indicator data. More information on the [Analysis and Methods document can be found in this file](#) on the [STWG webpage](#).

One of the questions asked of indicator representatives was “Does the indicators update calendar accurately reflect when your indicator documents are anticipated to be ready for review by the indicators coordinator?”

- For Stream Health, Katlyn Fuentes replied they do not have a specific date at this point when the update will be ready. Alison Santoro commented that Rikke Jepsen is responsible for collecting the monitoring data and is not available today to comment on that aspect. Alison commented she is responsible for the modeling work and it is taking longer than expected. Alison does not know at this point when the data will be ready. Katheryn said this is alright and asked that they do let her know when they are ready to update.
- For Climate Resiliency, Jamileh Soueidan commented the indicators should be ready for update by the end of July as the data has been acquired from Mike Kolian and the A&M document is nearly ready.
- For Forest Buffers, Sophie Waterman commented their data typically gets submitted in February and is then approved. However since Katie Brownson is the Point of Contact for this indicator and will be out on leave until September, Sophie said STWG should tentatively expect an indicator update sometime in October.
- For Fish Passage, Mary Andrews commented the 2020-2021 data updates should be ready in September 2022 as the data is currently being verified. Mary commented that their outcome made major updates last year to Chesapeake Progress which

included miles opened by dam removal and additional mapping, but that the data only covered through 2019.

The second question asked of indicator representatives was “Are there any indicators with communication concerns this cycle that are a change from previous reporting periods or requests for changes to the way the data has been displayed for [ChesapeakeProgress](#)? (We suggest you take a quick visit to your outcome’s page ahead of the meeting to make sure)”

- For Climate Resiliency, Jamileh commented she has been working with Kaitlyn May to put the currently existing monitoring and assessment indicators at the top of the page, followed by the indicators under refinement, then the indicators in development, and finally the static indicators which are no longer being updated. Jamileh added they would also like to explore different ways of visualizing the data for the existing indicators, like average air temperature and annual precipitation. Jamileh explained that she and Climate Resiliency Workgroup Coordinator Julie Reichert-Nguyen are concerned about these two indicators’ visualization as they might lead to erroneous conclusions due to the way the data in the maps are sub-basins are binned. Jamileh said in a future update, they would like to include additional visualizations for these indicators, such as including data in the spreadsheet or showing the previous reported data available at the sub-basin level so the magnitude of increase from the last reporting cycle is evident. Katheryn commented this is good to hear because it builds on previous conversations that took place between Katheryn and Julie on this topic. Doreen Vetter replied that Kaitlyn May is planning on reviewing the climate outcome requests this week and is working toward these items right now. Kaitlyn May confirmed this is the plan.
- For Fish Passage, Mary Andrews commented that since major updates were done to the outcome page on ChesapeakeProgress in 2019, Mary is satisfied with the current visualizations. The only expected updates are for the text and data that go into the indicator. Peter Tango asked if the updates represent change from baseline conditions that were established in the most recent report. Mary replied the indicator is reporting on miles opened, so the baseline is zero. Peter replied he confused this outcome with another comment made earlier and to disregard his question.
- For Forest Buffers, Sophie Waterman commented the indicator is generally regularly updated with the previous year’s data and asked why the 2021 data is not available and up on ChesapeakeProgress. Katheryn replied this is the case because the 2021 data needs to be approved and then go through Quality Assurance/Quality Control before it is ready to be put on ChesapeakeProgress.
- For Stream Health, Alison Santoro commented that percentage change visualized via the pie chart will remain the main visualization to communicate broad trends in biotic integrity. Alison said some maps of the watershed at either Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC) 8 or HUC 12 scale will be created to represent the condition of biotic integrity spatially and allow for investigation at specific locations. Katheryn Barnhart

commented this is good to hear and shared that Angie Wei will need to be involved in this effort to upload the data to ChesapeakeProgress.

The third question asked of indicator representatives was “For new indicators: are there any questions/concerns about the upcoming update that could be addressed in this format? Would an individual check-in with the indicators coordinator once documents are drafted be helpful?”

- There was no discussion of this question since none of the indicators being discussed were new and going through their first draft of updates.

The floor was then opened to confirm with any representatives who had not yet had the opportunity to share status of their indicator(s).

- Katheryn announced that Peter Tango and Qian Zhang have been working on a new indicator for the Water Quality Standards Attainment and Monitoring Outcome. Katheryn asked if they feel the work will be ready to present to STWG in August, and said that Peter and Qian should let her know by July 25th if they would like this item to be on the agenda. Qian replied that he is happy to present on updates to the TMDL load indicator to STWG whenever there is availability on the agenda. Qian added he is planning on presenting to the Modeling *Ad Hoc* team in August. Katheryn said she will follow up with an email to Peter and Qian about when this discussion should take place, in addition to an individual meeting about the potential timeline if Peter and Qian feel that is necessary. Peter Tango commented it might be helpful to invite others who specialize in status and trends, such as those from the USGS specific Chesapeake Bay Status and Trends group. Peter said this group in particular could have good synergy for this indicator given their expertise. Sam Austin and Kelly Maloney shared they are part of this USGS specific Chesapeake Bay Status and Trends group and would be happy to attend once the meeting is scheduled.

1:55 End of Meeting Survey – Alex Gunnerson

Meeting participants will be asked to complete an [end of meeting survey](#) to inform STWG leadership about how to best organize these meetings going forward.

Summary

Attendees were given the chance to provide feedback on the structure of STWG meetings in a very brief survey. The feedback will be used to inform the structure of future STWG meetings.

2:00 Adjourn

Participants: Alex Fries, Alexander Gunnerson, Alison Santoro, Amy Goldfischer, Angie Wei, Breck Sullivan, Doreen Vetter, Jake Solyst, Jamileh Soueidan, Kaitlyn May, Katheryn Barnhart, Katlyn Fuentes, Kelly Maloney, Kristin Saunders, Mary Andrews, Peter Tango, Qian Zhang, Samuel Austin, Sophie Waterman.