



## Status and Trends Workgroup Meeting

Monday, March 14, 2022

1:00 PM – 2:00 PM

Join by Webinar

Meeting Materials: [Link](#)

*This meeting was recorded for internal use to assure the accuracy of meeting notes.*

### Action Items

- Alex will share the synthesis document of the Jamboard Responses from the January meeting.
- Members and interested parties should complete the SOP document if they haven't already. This document is essential for ensuring the new direction for the STWG works effectively. This is due by Monday, 3/28 at the latest.
- Members will notify Katheryn if they think they should be in a different core outcome group or if they have any other comments regarding the [Focus Area document](#).
- Alex and Katheryn will work with outcome representatives on a potential new visualization method for the Focus Area Document to reflect outcomes that may fall into multiple categories depending on their indicator status.
- In preparation for the April meeting, Alex and Katheryn will reach out to indicators that are expected to be updated between now and July to make sure there is a time that works for everyone at the next small group meeting. Other meetings (small group and all-hands) will still be held on the second Monday of the month.
- Katheryn will coordinate with each focus group to develop a 12-month schedule of topics aimed to fulfill the workgroup's workplan and may refine it on a quarterly basis depending on group feedback and progress towards workplan items.

### AGENDA

#### 1:00 Opening and Roll Call, Announcements – Caroline Donovan, Chair

- The [finalized workplan](#) has been distributed and posted to the [STWG webpage](#).
- All outcome Point of Contacts are requested to fill out the Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) template if they have not already to streamline the process for future indicator updates.

#### 1:10 [Directionality for Future Meetings](#) – Katheryn Barnhart, Coordinator

##### Summary

Katheryn gave a brief overview of the takeaways from last meeting's discussion. She then presented a proposed format for future meetings that could help to both address topics of interest in a more thematically organized fashion as well as allow for reduced meeting

inflation for interested parties. Katheryn emphasized that these focus groups meetings will be required for their members, but that it should ensure that the meetings they are attending are relevant and fewer than the current arrangement. Katheryn outlined the four primary categories of focus areas that outcomes are grouped into and some of the general topics that each focus area may cover during their meetings. Katheryn concluded with a potential calendar of differing topics per focus areas over the course of the year. She then opened the floor for feedback/suggestions from the group.

### Discussion

In the chat, Kristin Saunders commented that she thinks these categories generally make sense and help the load feel more manageable for members. Doreen Vetter agreed with this comment.

Kristin Saunders suggested the role of STWG can be focused on moving outcomes and indicators without quantitative metrics to quantitative metrics. Katheryn agreed and said that thinking of groups of indicators as buckets, with the long-term goal of moving from one bucket to another is a good way to think about it. Kristin agreed with the bucket analogy. Katheryn added that it aligns with the workplan and that with this new reorganization there can be greater continuity in improving indicators.

Katheryn asked for feedback on the timing of these meetings throughout the year. Britt Slattery replied that based on this timeline, Goal Implementation Team (GIT) 5 would have to meet every month of the year, something she was not hoping for. Katheryn said the Healthy Watersheds GIT has the same issue and that to address this issue, there can be delegation to the specific workgroup, outcome, or individual depending on the indicator. Katheryn emphasized indicators in the “Updates and Maintenance of Existing Indicators” category only need to meet when they are due for updates, which realistically means meeting once a year or every other year. Caroline agreed and said one should plan ahead to delegate where possible and prioritize the most important meetings and missing ones that are less important. Carin Bisland replied that this is a good approach because the new structure is designed to make the meetings more efficient and effective. Carin expressed by focusing each meeting on like issues, attendees can get more from the meetings and hopefully fewer meetings overall.

Katheryn said each quarter she can send out potential ideas to the different small groups to gather feedback and understand their priorities for each meeting.

Pam Mason asked for the meeting materials to be resent to her. Pam said she is in a similar position to GIT 5 as the Wetlands Workgroup is expected to be at nearly all the meetings. Pam asked who the representative at each meeting should be and if it should be the staffer and/or coordinator. Katheryn replied it depends on the purpose of the meeting. For example, a Subject Matter Expert (SME) should be in attendance when the technical aspects of an indicator are being discussed, but when discussing indicator maintenance a coordinator may be more appropriate. The completed SOP template should help assign roles and responsibilities for who is expected from each workgroup to attend each meeting.

Katheryn said that in Pam's particular case, she would only need to come twice a year to help with the indicator refinement and re-evaluation of the wetlands outcome. Caroline replied that clarifying the status of core members for the Status and Trends Workgroup should help with determining who needs to attend. Katheryn said to make things clear, individuals will be assigned core membership status to focus areas that are relevant to their work.

Breck Sullivan asked where new indicators would fit within this framework. Breck gave the example of the Water Quality Standards and Attainment Monitoring Outcome and explained how they currently have an indicator, but they are in the early stages of developing a non-tidal indicator. Alison Santoro expressed that the Stream Health workgroup is also looking at other indicators. Breck asked if outcomes with a desire to create new indicators should reach out to STWG leadership directly. Katheryn said to make things simpler she made each outcome only fall under one group, but if your outcome has an indicator in good standing and is also planning on creating a new indicator, they are encouraged to come to the indicator development meetings. Katheryn expressed she will work on visualizing a second indicator for outcomes on the focus area document. Caroline emphasized the need for two way communication and encouraged participants to suggest agenda items. Katheryn agreed and explained that the topics for the focus area meetings come directly from the recently approved workplan and the January 2022 Jamboard responses.

#### **1:55 Next steps and Actions – Alex Gunnerson**

See the first page for action items and next steps.

#### **Adjourn**

**Participants:** Alex Gunnerson, Amy Goldfischer, Allison Ng, Alison Santoro, Amy Williams, Angie Wei, Britt Slattery, Breck Sullivan, Carin Bisland, Caroline Donovan, Doreen Vetter, Greg Allen, Jake Solyst, Jeremy Hanson, Julie Mawhorter, Julie Reichert-Nguyen, Katheryn Barnhart, Katie Brownson, Katlyn Fuentes, Kristin Saunders, Olivia Wisner, Pam Mason, Peter Tango, Qian Zhang, Rachel Felver, Rikke Jepsen, Sally Claggett.