



Joint Meeting of STAR's Indicators Workgroup
AND the CBP Coordinators/Staffers Group

August 9, 2012, 11AM – 12:30PM

Joe Macknis Memorial Conference Room (Fish Shack)

<http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/18447/>

ACTION ITEMS:

- **GIT and Workgroup coordinators/staff to provide to Nita, no later than Sept 13th**, any changes to the “next steps” outlined in [Status of CBP Indicator Updates/Changes](#) and to provide to Nita a completion plan for any that are due by the end of 2012.
- **Nita to communicate to STAR (9/27/12) and MB (10/10/12)** any changes to MB expectations (e.g. no longer possible to complete something the MB expected by the end of 2012).
- **Nita to elevate to STAR (for elevation to MB)** issues related to how we communicate Bay-related data/info of interest to the public, when the topic of interest is not a focus for any CBP GITs.
 - Do we have the freedom on ChesapeakeBay.net website to utilize data from other sources if CBP does not/cannot support the data-collection? Are there/should there be limitations on the sources used and how that info is communicated?
 - Nita/Carin to ask STAR/MB if Social Science group could/should be engaged to provide input/assistance with these issues.
- **Carin to allow time** for “story-telling” opportunities at beginning or end of Coordinator/Staffer mtgs (providing opportunities to connect stories to other GITs or topics, e.g. “swimmability”/TMDL connection). Consider elevating some “stories” to MB mtg agendas and ChesapeakeBay.net website.
- **Nita/Carin to elevate** the “embargo issue” to STAR/MB (refer to page 1 of [Status of CBP Indicator Updates/Changes](#))
- **Nita/Mike to remove** old oyster reef indicator, public access index and Bay Partner Community indicator.
- **Nita to revise** the A&M documentation template per recommendations from Communications Office (with modifications recommended by Carin). The new template will be used for indicator updates/development going forward.
- **Anna to send Nita** results of Watershed GIT poll related to the Developing Watershed Management Plans Indicator **and to work with Amy** to put the issue back on the agenda of the next Watershed GIT meeting
- **GIT coordinators/staffers should be preparing a list** of plans for the next 6 – 12 months and **sending them to Greg Barranco**. This includes anything that involves the Executive Order Strategy even if it does not have to be approved through the Management Board or Principals Staff Committee. The partnership should be aware of actions that are being taken at CBP.
- **The next meeting will be a joint STAR/Staffers/Coordinators mtg Aug 23rd**, 11AM – 12:30PM in CBPO Conference Rm 305a. Since the meeting is in 305a, in-person attendance should be limited to Staffers, Coordinators, and STAR Leadership.

SUMMARY:

- Discussed status and communication of indicator updates and changes
- Discussed current status of communication at CBP, the connections between the GIT goals, indicators, and the communications stories, gaps in communication, expectations, and how to tell better stories
- Discussed plans for updating/communicating indicators that are out of date, revisions or development of indicators, responding to MB feedback, communicating/tracking goals and how to tell better stories

PARTICIPANTS:

Carin Bisland, Chair
Coordinators/Staffers Group
Nita Sylvester, Chair IWG

Fisheries GIT
Bruce Vogt, coordinator
Adam Davis, staff

Habitat GIT
Jennifer Greiner, coordinator
Hannah Martin, staff

Water Quality GIT

Jeremy Hanson, staff

Watershed GIT

Anna Stuart Burnett, staff

Stewardship GIT

Amy Handen, coordinator

Partner/Lead/Manage GIT

Tim Wilke, staff

CWG

Caitlin Finnerty, staff

STAR

Peter Tango, coordinator

Amanda Pruzinsky, staff

NonTidal Workgroup

Katie Foreman

GIS Team

John Wolf

Web Team

Mike Land

Catherine Krikstan

ChesapeakeStat Team

Beth Zinecker

Forestry Workgroup

Sally Claggett

Other IWG Members

Greg Barranco

Jackie Johnson

Caroline Wicks

Darrell Brown

MEETING MINUTES:**Welcome/Introductions** – Nita Sylvester (Chair, CBP Indicators Workgroup)

- Nita Sylvester – The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the status and communication of indicators and goals/outcomes and plans for the rest of this year and next.
- Carin Bisland – (1) When discussing the indicators for the public, keep in mind that Performance Measures are related to the Decision Framework. (2) GITs should be preparing a list of plans for the next 6 – 12 months and sending it to Greg Barranco. This includes anything that involves the Executive Order Strategy even if it does not have to be approved through the Management Board or Principals Staff Committee. The partnership should be aware of actions that are being taken at CBP.
- Nita Sylvester – The next Coordinators/Staffers meeting will be a joint meeting with STAR. The discussion will be led by Carl Hershner and will cover STAR's involvement in helping the GITs developing monitoring programs, perform indicators, and assessment. Questions to keep in mind: What does the GIT want to track? Is the GIT tracking what it needs to track? How is the GIT going to track it? How is it related to the GIT? What are the expectations?
 - Carin Bisland – "What are the expectations?" is probably the hardest question, but one of the more important ones. In order for adaptive management to work, expectations must be set and then evaluated in order to determine progress and make adjustments.

Status and Communication of Indicator Updates/Changes – Nita Sylvester

Nita Sylvester led the discussion on the status and communication of indicator updates and changes.

Slide 2 and 3: Management Board and Our Own Expectations for 2012

- Update, revise, and develop indicators – Where we are and where we want to be

Slide 4: Issues – Indicator Updates Promised by End 2012

- **Action:** Review [Status of CBP Indicator Updates/Changes](#)
- **Action:** Determine whether changes must be made to the plan and if so, inform the Management Board

Slide 5 and 6: Issues – Communication

- Margaret Enloe – Currently, no plan for plan communication of indicators because lack of interaction between the Communications Workgroup and the GITs
- **Action:** Edits to communications section of the A&M documentation
 - Margaret Enloe – Keep in mind: Write as if writing for your grandmother or a 10 year old child
 - Carin Bisland – The question, “What did the data show last year?” should be more specific.

For more information the presentation is available here:

http://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/18447/are_we_mtg_expectations.pdf

Communication of Goals/Outcomes – Mike Land (CBP Web Administrator and Vice Chair of Communications Workgroup)

Mike Land discussed the current status of communication at CBP, the connections between the GIT goals, indicators, and the communications stories, gaps in communication, expectations, and how to tell better stories.

Slide 3: CBP Communication Currently

- The web is becoming the primary source of information and CBP must take advantage of it

Slide 4 and 5: Goal Definition Process

- Preliminary GIT Goal Statement
 - What’s next? What are the topics are going to develop into indicators? Which ones will CBP have stories on?

Slide 6 through 9: GITs Goals to Indicator to Stories

- Bottom up process
- Must include some top down approach to incorporate communication about what the public is interested and invested in

Slide 10 through 14: What about gaps?

- Not every goal becomes an indicator
- Even if some topics are not specifically in the GITs goals, they are still important to report to the public
- May have to think outside of indicators when communicating to the public

Is there an expectation that CBP communicates these topics?

- If the information is not coming from the goal process, how can CBP report it to the public in a meaningful way?

Slide 16 through 20:

- How do we communicate the addition/removal of indicators? Also, even if the public might not care, CBP must consider that the partners could.
- How will adaptive management affect communicating progress?
- How can we clarify indicators?
- CBP has the capability to tell better stories, utilize it!

For more information the presentation is available here:

http://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/18447/indicators_evolution_mikeland.pdf

Questions and Discussion

- Amy Handen – CBP should explain to the public why these indicators were chosen, but there will always be gaps. The indicators are supposed to direct the public's focus
- Carin Bisland – The Decision Framework is trying to bring together the two sections of the Indicators Framework, Health and Restoration.
- Greg Barranco – What the public perceives CBP does and what the public wants to hear about has a major impact on the entire Program. Even if crabs aren't a good indicator, they still want the information.
- Carin Bisland – CBP must also be careful about what is reported. If we are not doing anything to change the outcome, CBP should not take the responsibility for it.
- Sally Clagget – There must be a balance. Forest cover is something that CBP should cover, but is not directly influencing.
- Bruce Vogt – Striped bass is an example of an interesting and informative story. Last year because of the warm temperatures and DO issues, striped bass were moving around in small schools following bay fish, so fishermen knew exactly where to catch them. This covers weather conditions, water conditions, behavior of the fish, and behavior of the watermen. It isn't an indicator, but it is a story that should be told.
- Caroline – For Human Health, MDE is very careful about how they report beach closures and other human health issues.
 - Mike Land – It could be as simple as, "This is an issue. This is where you can find more information."
 - Adam Davis – Fish kills and beach closures should decrease with the CBP's execution of the TMDLs. Although CBP is not directly connected, CBP has an impact and is a place where the public looks for information.
 - Katie Foreman – Watershed information is lacking on the CBP webpage. CBP is very nutrient and sediment centric and that is a programmatic choice based on regulatory purposes, but building out our communications (particularly to the partner states), CBP has a chance to report on other topics such as bacteria.
 - Caitlin Finnerty – Although these things are not directly tackled at the CBP, everything is connected. CBP needs help finding those connections and reporting them.
- Mike Land – Much of this is political, so obviously CBP would need a communications plan.
- Mike Land – The Communications Workgroup needs to have a stronger connection to the GITs.
 - Peter Tango – The interview approach is very helpful.
 - Bruce Vogt – Who should the GITs go to with ideas? Answer: Mike Land

Recommendation to STAR and beyond

- Guidance for reporting data and information to the public that GITs do not have a goal tracking indicator
- Bruce Vogt – Staffer/Coordinators Meetings could be a forum for stories and topics that are related to CBP goals, but is not directly dealing with GIT goals
 - Carin Bisland – Should be at the end of the meetings to allow Margaret Enloe to be involved
- Jennifer Greiner – The Management Board's decision could be influenced by the question: To what extent is CBP getting requests for information about topics that the GITs do not cover? Also, could the newly formed Social Science Group could be a better place for this recommendation?
 - Nita Sylvester – Although the Social Science Group it is newly formed and probably still teasing out its purpose, we should invite them to the appropriate meetings and begin the decision with them.

- Nita Sylvester – In the past, during Management Board meetings there was a 15 minute presentation on information about the Bay. If the GITs work these stories through the Coordinators/Staffers meeting, we could potentially bring a 5 minute presentation to the management board.
 - Jennifer Greiner – We should make an effort to connect the stories. The Decision Framework’s “factors effecting” could be a way to connect.
- Jeremy – The videos and interviews could also be a great way to bring in local partners.

Action: If anyone has any other ideas, send them to Nita Sylvester and Greg Allen.

Plans for Rest of this Year and Next – All

Nita Sylvester led the discussion about plans for updating/communicating indicators that are out of date, revisions or development of indicators, responding to MB feedback, and communicating/tracking goals

Slide 2: Out-of-date Indicators

- **Action:** Update out-of-date indicators
- Sally Claggett – Does every indicator need to be updated yearly?
 - Nita Sylvester – Not necessarily, but if it is showing annual progress that CBP has been reporting annually, yes.

Slide 3: Revisions or Development of Indicators

- **Action:** Refresh expectations
- **Action:** Keep Nita Sylvester updated on progress

Slide 4: Other Indicator Questions and Issues

- Lists indicators that we may want to embargo or remove
 - Approval to remove? When do we remove? How do we communicate that? What is the process?
 - Fisheries GIT – Oyster Reef can be removed. Oyster, Striped Bass, Shad, and Menhaden Abundance will be updated.
 - Preserving Land and Public Access – Will be updated and old information will be linked to
 - Carin Bisland – Old information is better than no information. The recommendation is to keep them on the webpage until it is updated
 - **Action:** For the issue of embargoing – Elevate to STAR and request bringing for them to the Management Board

Slide 5: Responding to MB Feedback

- Has watershed GIT dismissed the Developing Watershed Management Plans Indicator? Anna Stuart-Burnett – A poll was sent out to the entire GIT with the recommendation to dismiss, but many of the states want to keep it until the goal is met even though it was due in 2010
 - **Action:** Send Nita Sylvester that information, so that she can report to STAR and information the Management Board
 - **Action:** Put this issue back on the agenda of the next Watershed GIT meeting
- Utility of Phytoplankton indicator; will its removal create a gap or are remaining indicators sufficient for category?
 - The Tidal Workgroup will have this question on the agenda at their September meeting
- Feasibility of updating Tidal Wetlands Abundance indicator?
 - The Habitat GIT with STAR’s help are working on this question
- American Shad Abundance indicator should continue to be reported

- After the first American Shad Action Team meeting, they should report to STAR and the Management Board
- Review new data/time period for Forest Cover indicator
 - Topic in September Forestry Workgroup meeting
 - Could also be presented at the September STAR meeting
- Determine if current mix of indicators in Watershed Health categories are sufficient
 - Non-tidal Workgroup and Watershed GIT
- Determine if current mix of indicators in Factors Impacting Health categories are sufficient
 - Non-tidal Workgroup

Slide 6: Communicating/Tracking Goals

For more information the presentation is available here:

http://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/18447/plans_for_rest_of_2012_and_2013.pdf

Other meeting material:

1. Review materials we provided to the MB in January 2012 ([How CBP Will Be Accountable and Communicate Assessment Information to the Public in 2012](#)) and April 2012 ([Communicating Assessment Information to the Public in 2012](#) and [2012 Indicator Overview](#))
2. Review materials from June 2012 STAR mtg ([Follow-up for STAR from April 11, 2012 MB Conference Call](#) and pages 4-5 of the [STAR mtg summary](#))
3. Review [Status of CBP Indicator Updates/Changes](#)
4. Review [CBP Indicator Press Releases to date](#)
5. Review “[GIT Goal Statements](#)” provided to the MB in June 2012 (and updated for August MB mtg).
6. Review [IWG 2012 Workplan](#) and [2012 CBP Communications Calendar](#)