

# Integration of Citizen-based and Nontraditional Monitoring into the Chesapeake Bay Program Partnership

Integrated Monitoring Network Meeting Follow-up  
May 18, 2016, 1 – 3 PM



## Instructions

1. **Please review the proposed criteria for identifying priority areas for citizen-based and nontraditional data integration or data gaps (below). Then, answer the following questions:**
  - a. Which of these criteria do you believe best serve as indicators of priority areas for citizen-based and nontraditional monitoring integration?
  - b. What additional information would be necessary for prioritization?
  - c. How should we rate/score the water bodies/areas identified by states and the Chesapeake Bay Program using these criteria?
2. **Identify FIVE areas or waterbodies that fit a few or a majority of the criteria listed.**
  - 1)
  - 2)
  - 3)
  - 4)
  - 5)
3. **After completing steps 1 and 2, send your results to Lea Rubin, the Chesapeake Monitoring Cooperative Coordinator at [lrubin@iwla.org](mailto:lrubin@iwla.org). Also, be prepared to discuss your results at the June INWG meeting on June 15, 2015. Your results will help guide the planning and invitation list for the Prioritization of Monitoring Integration Workshop this summer.**

## Location Prioritization for creating or expanding monitoring programs

The Integrated Monitoring Network Workgroup can provide valuable input on areas where there is a need for higher density data or where there is a data gap. The citizen-based and nontraditional integration project will be creating a report this fall that will prioritize working with monitoring groups in good standing (based on the Tier I, II & III requirements) to be incorporated into the Chesapeake Bay Program Monitoring Networks.

The worksheet below is designed to solicit your feedback on what areas the CBP or your state could benefit from having more water quality or benthic macroinvertebrate data collected by volunteer and non-traditional monitoring groups. Your responses will help inform and design a

workshop with the INWG and the Citizen-based and Nontraditional Monitoring Project Team to better establish the Chesapeake Bay citizen-based and nontraditional monitoring network.

All Tier III data, collected using the guidelines set by the CBP and used by the CBP Tidal and Nontidal Water Quality Monitoring Networks, will be considered a priority data set for integration.

The Citizen-based and Nontraditional Monitoring Project Team proposes the following criteria for prioritizing Tier I and Tier II data integration to be considered by each state when evaluating waterbodies/watersheds:

<b>Criteria for Consideration</b>	<b>Rating</b> (i.e. Strong Yes, Yes, No, Strong No)
<b>Waterbody/area under consideration:</b>	<i>example: Choptank River</i>
Is the waterbody in a selected under-represented source sector: urban, suburban or agriculture?	
Are there unexplainable hypoxic or anoxic events that more frequent monitoring could help explain?	
Are there BMP implementation plans in the near future? Could volunteer or nontraditional monitoring data help support baseline assessment prior to BMP implementation?	
Has a BMP recently been implemented and your state is interested in water quality progress due to that management action?	
Is there a suspected nutrient or sediment “hot spot” (i.e. algal blooms, septic leaks, fish kills, or high bacteria levels) without agency resources to support the continual monitoring of it?	
Has a fixed monitoring station or monitoring parameter recently been retired based on limited resources, but there is still interest in monitoring that waterbody or parameter?	
Are there monitoring stations at prominent input sites from streams and major tributaries?	
Would additional data contribute to a small watershed study?	
Does the waterbody have high public interest?	
Is the waterbody being considered as a sentinel site for climate change research?	
Is the region undergoing change and development?	
Is it an area without focused state monitoring efforts, but citizen and nontraditional monitors could serve as a “watch dog” for significant changes in water quality?	
Is it in an area being prioritized across multiple goals or outcomes from the Chesapeake Watershed Agreement?	

