



Non-Tidal Network Meeting

Wednesday, April 21, 2021

1:00 PM – 2:00 PM

Webinar*:

<https://umces.webex.com/umces/j.php?MTID=madff367fa514aad7078a5e394baabf6>

Conference Line: +1-408-418-9388 Access Code: 120 266 9519

Password: CBPNTN

Meeting Materials:

https://www.chesapeakebay.net/what/event/non_tidal_network_april_2021_meeting

*If you are joining by webinar, please open the webinar first, then dial in.

Action Items:

- ✓ Peter Tango will update the spreadsheet on station support and send it to people to fill in missing information.
- ✓ Breck Sullivan will create a Teams page for members to access documentation by the next NTN meeting.
- ✓ Peter Tango and Breck Sullivan will draft the Scope and Purpose for the NTN Workgroup to start the process of creating a chesapeakebay.net webpage for the workgroup.

AGENDA

1:00 Welcome, Introductions & Announcements – Peter Tango, NTN WG Coordinator (USGS @CBPO)

Mike Mallonee commented he received, accepted, and imported all NTN Water Year (WY) 2020 datasets into CEDAR except by one provider that should be in by next week.

1:10 Update on the spreadsheet work on station support – Peter Tango

Thank you for contributions on station support across the NTN network. It looks like we have a few holes yet to fill. This work will be a foundation in our network evaluation.

Peter will send the updated spreadsheet to people to fill in missing information especially from New York and West Virginia. He will aim to have it completed by the next meeting.

1:15 [Outline of questions to answer in the PSC review: Setting some expectations for developing recommendations](#) – Peter Tango

Peter will highlight the 8 questions guiding our input to the PSC. There is perhaps 75% of the information in various corners of our daily world already, but there is a 25% where

community wisdom, insight, knowledge and discussion will tune our vision for the network going forward and fulfill guidance to the PSC on sustaining the NTN.

The Principal Staff Committee (PSC) was interested in understanding the CBP budget and funding for monitoring. Lee McDonnell shared this information at the last PSC meeting while sharing with them information on everything that goes into the monitoring program. The five monitoring networks discussed were tidal water quality, nontidal nutrients and sediment, Submerged Aquatic Vegetation (SAV), tidal benthic organisms, and citizen monitoring. In the presentation to the PSC, they acknowledged there is a history of resource stresses to sustain and grow the monitoring program, but there is research developments and innovations providing options to address capacity gaps. PSC recognized that the monitoring program needs to grow so they requested information on what is needed to improve the CBP monitoring networks.

Peter Tango commented STAR will lead this effort in collaboration with Scientific Technical Advisory Committee (STAC), Chesapeake Bay Program (CBP) Goal Implementation Teams (GITs), and partners participating in the monitoring networks. The process will take 9 months to provide the PSC recommendations while answering 8 questions on the status and threats of the monitoring program. The eight questions consist of:

- Network status
 - Numerous summaries are available about the network status, and examples are available on the CBP website. Some of these summaries have not been updated to include changes in the monitoring network.
- Vulnerabilities
 - An example is a list of stations that may be lost due to funding or safety issues.
- Programming strategy
 - This question addresses what the cost is of sustaining existing operations which is available in the grant documents.
- Information gaps to fill
 - Use the gaps identified in the CBP Science Needs Database and assess if there are any gaps missing and how they can be addressed.
- Monitoring program options to fill gaps
 - Identify if current monitoring products can fill information gaps. This will be discussions at future workgroup meetings across the CBP and at newly accepted STAC Workshop.
- What innovations are available
 - Discuss utility and readiness of innovations, the data, and the products especially through the STAC Workshop to see how it can improve the monitoring program.
- Who – partners for addressing information gap data and products
 - Once the innovations are identified, the groups will provide a list of current and potential partners.

- Detail on financials for sustaining and growing network to meeting information needs
 - o Provide a list that reflects the costs of these needs.

This will be a collaborative effort through multiple network groups along with supporting CBP groups including the NTN Workgroup. The proposed timeline is to capture the status and vulnerabilities of existing networks during Spring 2021, innovation assessment and financials of sustaining networks during Summer 2021, and evaluation limitations, financials for adopting innovations, and recommendations in Fall 2021.

At the next meeting, Peter Tango will go over the vulnerabilities in the nontidal network. He asks members to think within their networks about the vulnerabilities they have experienced such as cost structure, security issues due to a global pandemic, etc. He would also like them to consider what it means to sustain the network.

Scott Phillips asked what is the timing for bringing in science needs from other topics such as climate. Peter Tango said he is looking to tie them in during the summer. Right now, during the spring, he would like to work on the status and vulnerabilities of the networks.

1:30 Network evaluation: 9 months and beyond – Peter Tango, Joel Blomquist, Tammy Zimmerman, Mark Nardi, Doug Moyer

To provide effective, actionable recommendations for the PSC, we need to define the status of our network and work with the best understanding available of our budget picture. The foundational assumption in the 9-month review for the NTN is that we are operating under a level funding scenario for the next 5 years of NTN operations. A first principal rule is that any adjustments over time will be coordinated and distributed so as not to impact a single jurisdiction (+ or -) in an overwhelming way. A proposed evaluation strategy will be presented that includes 3 themes - 1) understanding the economics underpinning existing support, 2) update our representativeness assessment from 2010 for NTN stations to collectively evaluate our gaps, underrepresentation, and overrepresentation issues in our network, 3) create scenarios and options that address station and analysis support to match available resources with costs to run the network. Key stakeholders that have contributed considerations in the past (e.g., Watershed modeling community) will be invited in the upcoming months to provide input on considerations for how the portfolio of network operations can further enhance decision-support. The output of the evaluation is aimed at providing network status statements and recommendations to the PSC on vulnerabilities with no new funding which further provides a justified funding target for sustaining our 123 station operations and NTN analysis support over the next 5 years as well as possible enhancements to address stakeholder needs.

Joel Blomquist said they have some tools prepared to look at the network in a way that reflects what was done 10 years ago when they went through a redesign process. It will let them know how well they did along with what gaps are still present across jurisdictions. They are not near the point of prioritization. They are in an evaluation process right now. They hope to produce graphics available for people to understand their sites. While they go through this process, they are open to ideas on how to approach it. Breck Sullivan will create a Teams page for members to access documentation by the next NTN meeting.

Tom Parham asked if this network evaluation effort is the same as the effort for evaluating each site which they started a few months ago. They collected information on whether the site has an uniform watershed or unique due to the geology in the area. Joel Blomquist said it is different but complimentary. Joel plans to pull together graphics about the sites relate to the overall distribution of conditions such as land use or nutrient loads across the watershed. It will show overlap of sites, but if someone tried to prioritize the sites, there are a lot of different characteristics that come into play. Tom said then at some point they still need to answer those other questions. Peter Tango said they will need to circle back later on how to reach making decisions on adjusting the network.

Bruce Michael said all the partners agree with this exercise and would like to provide their information and insight. Having one document that the partners can look at will be useful in the long run. Joel Blomquist thinks once there is a consistent way to look at sites across the networks it will help jurisdictions fill out the spreadsheet because it will help them reflect with context. Bruce also stated one goal for CBP for a site, but a lot of the sites have multiple and different goals based on the users for the information and the funding agencies.

Bruce asked when the document would be available for the partners. Joel Blomquist said not prior to May's meeting, but hopefully shortly after because they are lining up staff to do it.

Tom Parham asked when the 9 months are done. Peter Tango said he would like to give the PSC recommendations towards the end of the year (late fall) because there is leadership change within the PSC starting in 2022. Scott Phillips said at least for the federal budget process, the process to get enhanced funding for FY23 starts now. They could wait until the fall to get recommendations to fit it into the administration budget which gets released next February. If they were trying to get help from Congress, January is when they write their letter to say they want increased funding for certain sectors so that would be a great opportunity to ask for increased funding for monitoring. Joel Blomquist stated what will be gathered between now and the next NTN meeting can help with budget processes going on now. The information needed should be included in the status and vulnerabilities so their should be material to draw open for information needed soon.

2:00 Adjourn

Next meeting: Wednesday, May 19, 2021, 1 PM – 2:30 PM

Topics:

Ongoing, follow-up with network evaluation steps supporting recommendation development for the CBP-PSC review.

Cacapon River Science, West Virginia: Factors affecting primary productivity, plus, habitat monitoring and living resource diversity. Some Q&A to consider.

Please reach out to Breck and Peter if you have an additional issue or topic you would like to have represented on a future NTN agenda. Thank you!

Scott Phillips suggested, at a future NTN meeting, he would like to discuss monitoring gaps that Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) would like to see addressed to improve monitoring for (1) focusing placement of practices, and (2) water-quality response to conservation practices.

Doug Moyer asked if NRCS is also offering funding to add to the network or are they looking to fill with existing funding and resources. CBP is looking to preserve the network and understanding what that may take along with looking into the future for adjustments. Doug is wondering if that is something NCRS can contribute to. Scott Phillips said yes, they put a \$1M into PA for enhanced monitoring.

Round robin setting at next meeting to state status and vulnerabilities.

Participants: Breck Sullivan, Peter Tango, Mark Nardi, Joel Blomquist, Tammy Zimmerman, Cindy Johnson, Doug Chambers, Jon Dillow, Jamie Shallenberger, Durga Ghosh, Kristen Heyer, Ken Hyer, Scott Phillips, E Campbell, Tom Parham, Doug Moyer, John Wirts, Mike Mallonee, Tyler,, Bruce Michael, Curtis Schreffler, Lucretia Brown