

Status and Trends Workgroup

Minutes

May 9, 2017 from 1:00-3:00 PM

Website: <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/24686/>

1:00-1:05 pm Opening (Laura Free, 5 minutes)

- No previous Action items to be discussed.

1:05-1:20 pm Indicators in Development: Citizen Stewardship Indicator (Laura Free, 40 minutes)

Objective: This agenda item will feature presentations or discussions led by outcome representatives (GIT coordinators, staffers, or other outcome leads) as they develop new indicators. Specific topics will change each month as needed.

Desired Outcome: Workgroup is knowledgeable about the direction of development, provides advice or recommendations on options presented, and is prepared to engage on a more detailed level with the Citizen Stewardship workgroup.

The hope is that the results of this indicators will be available by June 2017.

Steve Raabe- [See Presentation.](#)

Steve Raabe from OpinonWorks, provided an overview of the Citizen Stewardship Indicator and efforts that went into creating it. The results that are in this presentation are to-date and unweighted, and will therefore shift as more data comes in. This indicator will inform the stewardship outcome within the Citizen Stewardship Management Strategy. Steve reviewed the Citizen Stewardship Framework, the benefits of measuring stewardship, stewardship behavior measurement criteria, and measured behaviors included in the indicator. This tool is designed to help practitioners best involve the public and build public support for Bay restoration work.

This indicator measures adoption of stewardship behaviors, volunteerism behavior, civic engagement behavior, likelihood of future adoption of behaviors, and keys to individual engagement.

This tool does not track behavior of individuals, but rather general population.

This tool can measure and track stewardship progress, inform smart behavior selection for practitioners, segment data by major jurisdiction, demographic, as well as provide a resource for other CBP priorities such as Public Access or Diversity.

This tool does not verify implementation of behaviors or practices, answer *why* questions, measure public policy references, or measure perceptions and attitudes.

Kristen added that original discussions of this indicator included the value added to the whole CBP, other GITs and workgroups, as well as the Stewardship group. Public Access or Diversity groups will be able to use this information, but there's potential for many more. Steve agreed that there needs to be more discussions about these applications.

There was a question of whether this data was weighted by distance to the watershed. Steve responded that that analysis could be done with this data since zip code was collected.

There is an error on the slide for numbers of samples: Three largest jurisdictions VA, MD, PA have 1,000 calls, DC has 800 calls. This error has been corrected.

This data will all be available on ChesapeakeProgress in the near future. Ideally this data will be searchable to easily pull out segments, but currently this data is raw.

The slide of negative behaviors included fertilizer, pesticide, and herbicide usage, which was not entirely agreed upon in development AS a *negative* behavior, since the university and many agencies recommend these behaviors to a certain extent to the public.

When the survey is administered, the party for whom the survey is being conducted is not identified until then end. Caller ID is local to the participant's state, with a voicemail box that allows for description of the survey to facilitate involvement in the event that a participant calls back to the number.

Slide 24 of 51: There was input on the slide that included behavior scoring and the recommendation of changing the colors for this slide. A paragraph is needed to explain that these behaviors are from a 0-100 scale of the people polled and what this scale means.

There was a question about a financial income analysis, which Steve confirmed could be done with this data, since income data was collected.

Steve discussed how behaviors that are less susceptible to change should not be viewed as behaviors that should no longer be of focus for citizen programs. Really, these results simply provide a starting point, and should be conveyed to the practitioners as such. Some of these behaviors include a small section of the population, so there needs to be an awareness of how large or small of a group programs intent to reach to move citizens forward on the spectrum of environmentally friendly behavior adoption. However, the indicator formula contextualizes this information by acknowledging the relationship between adoption, likelihood and impact.

Jessica asked what can be inferred from the "neutral" percentages in levels of agreement in actions and responsibility perceptions of the public. Is neutral a lack of information? Steve responded there are many possible reasons for this neutral level, but the survey does not look into these reasons. The overall goal is to move groups up the scale towards agreement and action, not so much to target a particular segment or level of response.

There was a discussion of the "My actions contribute to water pollution where I live" and how much can be inferred from this question. Steve responded with the general comment that when these results and findings are being conveyed to the public, we need to agree on a main focus. There may be lower level results that are ALSO accurate, but there is a high-level focus for these results and findings that should be broadcast to the public, regardless of complexity in understanding the why behind them.

Next Steps: The intent is to make this data available during or after Bay Awareness Week June 3-11, 2017. Public sharing of key findings will continue, as well as the work that will make this indicator useful and accessible to practitioners.

Amy asked for feedback. Would scheduling another event for discussion be helpful? Email?

Lou added that there have been plenty of opportunity for discussion. **ACTION: Additional thoughts should be provided thru email within the next three weeks.** There's about 3 weeks until the

communication process starts for this indicator and it becomes released. Steve reminded the group that the high level messages, not ALL, will be released during this time. Caroline added that another meeting or follow up call IS needed to further discuss some of the concerns brought up during the meeting, especially related to the roll-up of the stewardship index into one number and the common understanding and communication of what that number means. Al Todd asked WHO should be involved in that follow up? **ACTION: Laura added that future meetings and emails on the release of the Stewardship indicator should include participants in today’s discussion.**

Jen added that there should be reasons conveyed to the public why this data might be used/helpful along with the data itself.

Caroline wanted to confirm if this information was going to be called an “index” or “indicator”. Steve agreed that this will be a conversation that needs to happen. Steve added that this information can be translated as a percentage of effort. Al added that we DO want this on a 0-100 scale. On 0-100, 100 represents full capacity stewardship. Other workgroup members expressed a desire to discuss this further.

Key questions are around the messaging of the information and the longterm use of this information.

ACTION: Rachel discussed that a draft of the press release and web text surrounding the indicator will be worked up, to be presented to the group, to allow for feedback.

There was discussion of focus of findings or numbers. Currently the rough draft of the press releases focuses on the actions and findings rather than the Stewardship index number.

ACTION ITEMS:

ACTION	RESPONSIBLE PARTY
ACTION: Additional thoughts should be provided thru email to Amy Handen or Laura Free within the next three weeks.	The group
ACTION: Laura added that future meetings and emails on the release of the Stewardship indicator should include participants in today’s discussion.	Laura Free
ACTION: Rachel discussed that a draft of the press release will be worked up, to be presented to the group, to allow for feedback.	Rachel Felver and Comm. Team

Participants

Amy Handen	amy_handen@nps.gov
Catherine Krikstan	ckrikstan@chesapeakebay.net
Doreen Vetter	vetter.doreen@epa.gov
John Schneider	John.Schneider@state.de.us
Kristin Saunders	kisaunders@umces.edu

Scientific, Technical Assessment and Reporting (STAR) Team
Chesapeake Bay Program

Laura Free	free.laura@epa.gov
Melissa Merritt	mmerritt@chesapeakebay.net
Rachel Felver	rfelver@chesapeakebay.net
Sally Claggett	sclaggett@fs.fed.us
Shannon Sprague	shannon.sprague@noaa.gov
Stephanie Smith	ssmith@chesapeakebay.net
Drew Pizzala	drew_pizzala@partner.nps.gov
Lou Etgen	letgen@allianceforthebay.org
Curtis Dalpra	Cdalpra@ICPRB.org
Al Todd	atodd@allianceforthebay.org
Jen Dindinger	jdinding@umd.edu
Donald Masters	
Jessica Blackburn	jblackburn@allianceforthebay.org
Julie Lawson	
Amy Williams	amywilli@pa.gov
Caroline Donovan	cdonovan@ca.umces.edu
Suzanne Etgen	
Alana Hartman	Alana.C.Hartman@wv.gov
Cindy Smith	
Peter Spadaro	
Steve Raabe	Steve@opinionworks.com