



**Scientific, Technical Assessment and Reporting (STAR) Meeting**  
Topic: Dry Run for CBP outcomes under the Healthy Watershed Cohort  
Thursday, July 25, 2019

**NOTE TIME CHANGE:** 9:30 AM –12:45 PM

Conference Line: 929-205-6099 Meeting ID: 984-334-403

Webinar\*: <https://zoom.us/j/984334403>

Meeting Materials:

[https://www.chesapeakebay.net/what/event/scientific technical assessment and reporting star team meeting july 2019](https://www.chesapeakebay.net/what/event/scientific_technical_assessment_and_reporting_star_team_meeting_july_2019)

Location: Fish Shack

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

**AGENDA**

**9:30 Welcome, Introductions & Announcements – Bill Dennison (UMCES) and Scott Phillips (USGS)- STAR Co-Chairs, Peter Tango (USGS) and Emily Trentacoste (EPA), STAR Co- Coordinator**

**Upcoming Conferences, Meetings, Workshops, & Webinars-**

- [Coastal and Estuarine Research Federation Conference](#) (CERF), November 3 – 7, 2019. Mobile, Alabama. Abstracts due May 1, 2019.
- [Annual Water Resources Conference](#) (AWRA), November 3 – 7, 2019. Salt Lake, Utah. Abstracts due May 6, 2019.
- [AGU Understanding Carbon Climate Feedbacks](#), August 26 – 29, 2019. San Diego, CA. Abstracts due May 8, 2019.
- [Ocean Sciences Meeting](#), February 16 – 21, 2020. San Diego, CA.
- [A Community on Ecosystem Services](#) (ACES), December 14-17, 2020. Bonita Springs, FL.

**9:40 Dry Runs of Healthy Watersheds Cohort Presentations**

There are 6 CBP outcomes, organized under Healthy Watershed Cohort, that will be reviewed by the Management Board on August 15. The dry run for STAR provides an opportunity for each outcome to provide their MB presentation, and get suggestions for improvements. The presentations should follow the guidelines provided under the Strategy Review System, and on Chesapeake Decisions.

In addition to providing suggestions on the presentation content, STAR will be looking to discuss the following questions to keep up to date on science needs and climate resiliency activities:

- Do you have any additional science needs that were identified through the review process?
- Have you identified gaps in resources to address your science needs?
- How do you plan to address Climate Resiliency as you revise your Management Strategy and Work Plan?

**9:40**

**Brook Trout – Stephen Faulkner (USGS)**

The workgroup is currently not on track to reaching their outcome due to both scientific and programmatic challenges. The workgroup recognizes that stream water temperature is the best predictor of Brook Trout occurrence, but they cannot measure it everywhere, so they model it. They need information at decision-relevant scales, generally highest resolution as possible. The scale has a huge effect on the perception of Brook Trout health. For example, the watershed scale shows Brook Trout occupancy at 76%, but if the catchment scaled is used for the same watershed, then there is only 11% occupancy. The workgroup has success when actions closely align with state or federal actions. Challenges they face for full implementation of work plan actions are hampered by limited resources and personnel. The workgroup has limited success with cross-GIT collaborations and engagement with CBP teams related to identifying/communication with local decision makers. They need to average 108 square kilometers per year to reach their goal, but they are not accomplishing this number. It is not helpful that some restoration opportunities are being utilized outside the watershed. In the future, the workgroup is looking for new research findings related to genetics, restoration, methodologies, impacts of climate and land use change. They need help with:

- CBP/other staff support to help develop communication/outreach plan, identify key decision-makers
- CBP staff support to help develop and maintain implementation tracking spreadsheet/tool
- MB help to address insufficient monitoring data to adequately track progress towards outcome
- MB help to address insufficient support for full participation of BTAT members

Comments on the presentation from STAR members and interested parties present at the meeting:

- The more detail included for the MB asks the better
- Dave Goshorn suggested connecting with the Local Leadership Workgroup because they have worked on a communication strategy
- Jennifer Greiner suggested using the co-benefits factsheet as a resource to give out to local leaders and jurisdictions

- For your first ask, Kristen Saunders suggest to be more specific about what information needs to go through the local leadership strategy because without that detail, the MB members may just push this action off to the Communications Workgroup or Local Leadership Workgroup
- Kristen Saunders also suggested to highlight that even though the mapping isn't complete, once it is done, the workgroup would like the MB members to know specific target areas in their jurisdiction - want the MB to own the action!
- Dave Goshorn suggested to be more specific with what you are asking for in staff support (names, time?)
- Dave Goshorn stated to highlight how these MB asks will help with the trajectory of the outcome.
- Scott Phillips recommends putting the asks in categories:
  - Science - MB help to address insufficient monitoring data to adequately track progress towards outcome. What programs do the jurisdictions already have for this? The workgroup cannot track without monitoring, and the states have the monitoring.
  - Resources – need of staff, need of financial support (highlight how it is a trivial amount), need the MB local and state leaders to be involved
- Carin Bisland suggested to remind the MB that the workgroup has been doing things to fill in the gaps and only want help to fill in more and to make the connection to the Bay jurisdictions

**10:10**

Stream Health – **Matt Meyers** (Fairfax County)

Successful endeavors by the workgroup include coordination with the Urban Stormwater Workgroup on stream restoration protocols, engaging with the Chesapeake Bay Trust Restoration Research and progress in permitting of stream corridor restoration projects. Some challenges they have faced include addressing functional lift beyond nutrients and sediments and difficulty with local impairments. The workgroup's actual progress includes multiple good and fair sites but also some poor and very poor sites along with a lot of insufficient data. In the future, they plan to have a data call for 2012 – 2017, discuss changing the wording of the outcome from 10% stream miles to watershed area and improve coordination with healthy watershed, forest, and fish passage workgroups. They need help with:

- Stream health outcome discussion
- Staff support for stressor white paper
- Continue to support active participation from all jurisdictions
- Limit and simplify work group reporting to focus on implementing work plan

Comments on the presentation from STAR members and interested parties present at the meeting:

- Put the asks into categories to highlight more of the monitoring needs
- Bill Dennison suggested putting in the watershed map they used in the UMCES report card because it will show all the areas with insufficient data, enhances the message the workgroup is trying to get across with pie chart
- Carin Bisland suggested to make the asks more specific because as a MB member she doesn't know what she should do for them
- Emily Trentacoste suggested giving a path forward for these asks – example – in the future, bringing the discussion back to the MB about possibly changing the wording of the outcome
- Bill Dennison suggested a STAC workshop as a potential path forward for the stressor paper
- Renee Thompson suggested making the main words on the pyramid image larger and adding more detail on what you would be investigating with the paper. She also mentioned the stream health workgroup having a conversation with the healthy watershed workgroup because the healthy watershed assessment coming out later in the summer could help with making the decision to change from stream miles to watershed acres. This could also be used as an example of collaboration.
- Kristin Saunders mentioned to be ready to answer why it is important to explore this change of the outcome such as saying....After 5 years of doing blank we learned blank and considering to change the outcome
- An idea given was to put the change of the outcome on the lessons learned slide since at the moment you are not asking the MB to do anything, but still give them a heads up that the discussion is coming
- It was suggested to name the jurisdictional support in the supporting materials
- Carin Bisland suggested reaching out to the ACB on the citizen monitoring network that they are working on to see if there is something that they can work on to fill some of the gaps. Emily Trentacoste responded she has been having discussions with Liz Chudoba at ACB on exactly this topic. One of our C-STREAM interns Dia has been looking at the data available from CMC this summer to get a basic idea of what sort of citizen data we have and where.

**10:40**

Fish Habitat – **Morgan Corey** (CRC)

The Workgroup had success with their Fish Habitat Workshop and Report which identified and refined understanding of critical stressors and science and research needs. They also received six NOAA funded fish habitat focused studies and completed the shoreline condition threshold study. They have a challenge of completing their action item 3.1 which is to overlay assessment datasets in

geospatial context to prioritize habitat areas. This will be a long-term goal due to still building datasets. They also have the challenge of engaging and communicating with varied audiences and including habitat considerations in fisheries management, local planning, and WIP BMP actions. The workgroup currently does not have an indicator to track their progress so they hope in the future to develop a metric. They also plan to do a GIT funded project for shoreline communication to coastal landowners, metadata inventory & analysis for regional assessment to inform pilot assessments and complete communication strategy focused on communicating economic impacts of fisheries on a local level and priority stressors. They need help with:

- WIP Engagement
  - Last SRS review, they asked for improved use of BMPs beneficial to fish habitat in WIPs
  - Support in evaluating what changed as a result of previous ask and identifying clear engagement opportunities
- Setting Shoreline Hardening Limits
  - Use shoreline threshold results to recommend shoreline hardening limits to states, and work with states to adopt into regulation and/or policy

Comments on the presentation from STAR members and interested parties present at the meeting:

- Bill Dennison suggested first working with the Local Leaderships Communication Strategy and other outlets to get the word out there about the shoreline threshold, get them to buy into it then go to them asking for states to adopt into the regulation and/or policy
- Scott Phillips suggested adding more diagrams on showing connections to other workgroups

## 11:10

### Fish Passage – **Mary Andrews** (NOAA)

The first part of the outcome for this workgroup was met in 2016, and they are continuing with a rate of 132 miles of fish migratory routes every 2 years. A challenge they continue to face is interest by dam owners for removal. In the future, the workgroup plans to address fish passage at road-stream crossing due to the increase in storm events and higher river flows. They also learned to investigate more on the removal or retrofit of culverts for fish passage. They need help with:

- Bringing awareness to dam safety programs that dam removal is a viable option to consider along with the usual “repair or replace” options under dam safety regulations and planning.

Comments on the presentation from STAR members and interested parties present at the meeting:

- Identification of a VA representative to attend their VA Fish Passage meetings.
- Scott Phillips asked why the workgroup did not present on fish ladders. Once the answer was provided, he suggested to add this answer into the presentation so that the MB knows it was addressed.
- Bill Dennison suggested adding a picture of a good culvert and a bad culvert
- Bruce Vogt agrees with this and suggests to tie it to climate change
- During the presentation Mary presented on more detail during the ask slide that is not included in the actual slide. Dave Goshorn suggested adding that information into the slide.
- Kristin Saunders recommended adding into the presentation the reason why the workgroup was so successful by getting resources
- Carin Bisland states she would like the workgroup to address the second part of the outcome
- Scott Phillips agrees Carin to add information on the presentation how the workgroup has met the second part of the outcome
- Bill Dennison mentioned to talk about the sediment portion and not just have it on the slide

**11:40**

#### Healthy Watersheds – **Angel Valdez** (MDE)

The Healthy Watersheds Workgroup has been focusing on the assessment from Tetra Tech which gathered metrics to assess watershed health to help create a watershed health index. The assessment is based off the EPA assessment but with focused Chesapeake Bay Program watershed goals and characteristics. It will track and assess health across the watershed to create baselines, and it will also break down the vulnerability of the watershed which can help with local engagement. An example of a success is the “Buffer in a Bag” Program in NY. This program gives landowners native trees and shrubs to plant and maintain a riparian buffer on their property. In the future, the workgroup wants to develop indicators, incorporate climate change data into the assessment, and move the assessment forward. They need help with:

- Renewed member engagement
- Prioritizing their outcome in other groups
- Coordination among GITs and workgroups
- Share key information with stakeholders

Comments on the presentation from STAR members and interested parties present at the meeting:

- Dave Goshorn likes the graphic on the help needed slide but need to add more detail for what the MB needs to do

- Dave Goshorn also suggested to add the need for an indicator or a way to track a healthy watershed and in the supporting materials put specifically what support you need

**12:10**

**Protected Lands – Jonathan Doherty (NPS)**

The workgroup is on track to reach their goal with 68% of the 2-million-acre goal achieved. They have seen success with management actions which provide information and education that supports public financing, policy and new financing sources. Challenges the workgroup faces are that progress is facilitated or constrained by availability of public and private sector financing sources. Also sustaining and increasing the funding levels is critical to maintaining progress and meeting the 2025 goal. In the future, they will look into how key trends/issues influence protection (climate, biodiversity, urban populations, development), how commercial scale solar and wind generation will shift or effect land conservation and look at the infrastructure management impact.

They need help with:

- Invest in engaging new generation of conservationists
- Sustain and grow public financing for land conservation
- Facilitate new sources of financing for land conservation (e.g. private capital)
- Fund science and research on trends influencing land protection

Comments on the presentation from STAR members and interested parties present at the meeting:

- The pie graph and the numbers on it need to be larger because the audience cannot read it
- Bill Dennison suggested to add the word diversifying into the new generation ask
- Peter Claggett suggested to add carbon into the presentation
- Dave Goshorn suggested to be more specific with the asks because the MB need to know what they can do
- Bruce Vogt suggested to make the connection between land conservation to TMDLs, healthy watersheds, fish habitat, address the co-benefits
- Scott Phillips suggested to add the workgroups five values to showcase the connection between the other workgroups

**12:40**

**Wrap-up**

**12:45**

**Adjourn**

**Next Meeting Dates:** August 22<sup>nd</sup>

**Participants:** Hilary Swartwood, Laurel Abwod, Kristen Saunders, Renee Thompson, Jennifer Greiner, Julianna Greenberg, Morgan Corey, Dave Goshorn, Bruce Michael, Bruce Vogt

Stephen Faulkner, Matt Meyer, Sara Ramotnik, Laura Exar, Doug Auston, Greg Barranco, John Wolf, Gary Shenk, Scott Phillips, Danny Giddings, Ken Hirer, Greg Noie, Kelly Maloney, Tom Parham, Bill Jenkins, Emily Trentacoste, Liz Chudoba, Mike Mallonee, Doreen Vetter, Mary Andrews, Johnathan Doherty, Drew Pizzala, Angel Valdez, Peter Claggett, Bill Dennison, Breck Sullivan, Cuiyin Wu