# Integrated Monitoring Networks Workgroup (INWG) Conference Call

**Wednesday, January 20, 2016**
**1:00- 3:00 PM**
**CBPO Location: NPS Large Conference Room**
**Conference Line**: 1-866-299-3188 **Code** 267-985-6222
**Adobe Connect:** http://epawebconferencing.acms.com/inwg/ (enter as guest)
**Meeting Materials:** http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/23479

## Minutes

**1:00 Welcome, Introductions, Announcements** *(Peter Tango – Coordinator)*

- Each meeting of the IMN will involve the Citizen Science Project Team

**1:10 Citizen Science. Review and discussion of the Tiered Framework of Nontraditional Partner data classification** *(Julie Vastine, ALLARM; Lea Rubin, Izaak Walton League)*

*Julie Vastine will present the data requirements and data uses recommended by the project team in the draft Tiered Framework document for the integration of nontraditional partner data. The attached document provides background support to the framework. The concept of the framework has been previously presented.*
*Julie will review the next steps for developing the Tier-specific data QAPPs and how the INWG can be involved in this process. We appreciate your immediate feedback on the framework document recognizing the comment period extends to the January 28th STAR meeting.*

*NOTES*

- See Presentation: IMN Tiered Framework- Julie Vastine
- Discussion: What are the expectations about tier 2 data use?
- This framework is a structure for data classification and guidance. A reference for data suppliers to possibly advance to another tier of data, as well as for the user to explore data sets and filter through the classifications.
- This will go to STAR and the WQ GIT for approval of its use as a guidance document for the Bay Program. Please provide any feedback or comments.
- There was discussion about the need for solid coordination to avoid gaps or overlap- a focus on organizing the uses and needs of the data.

**1:40 Continuous Monitoring Water Quality Monitoring Strategy Planning, Priority and Objectives – continued.** *(All Discussion)*
*Notes:*

- MD DNR is moving forward on recommendations regarding Enhanced Monitoring Strategies within MD. The CBP is moving in parallel and developing its strategy document to support the existing and planned uses of high frequency monitoring for bay and watershed health metric and indicator assessments. Previous meetings included presentations and discussion on work underway across the watershed with multiple applications of high frequency monitoring data. However, we need to consolidate the record of applications as a reference to use in educating the partnership on environmental health assessments in high temporal and spatial resolution, the value of high frequency monitoring data in improving

our understanding of the ecosystem, and have this material available when requesting support that sustains or grows our monitoring networks.

- **ACTION:** Continue to evaluate the range of objectives for inclusion or modification before inclusion in a wider, CBP enhanced monitoring strategy in tidal and nontidal waters. Use discussion results to build out our CBP Enhanced Monitoring Strategy.

  **Background: MD DNR Draft Enhanced Monitoring Objectives:**
  - Track progress towards meeting water quality criteria goals for water clarity and dissolved oxygen (30 day, 7 day and instantaneous).
  - Measure and assess the status and trends of nutrient and sediment concentrations in the tidal segments
  - Help assess factors affecting nutrient status and trends
  - Improve calibration and verification of watershed models
  - Complement tidal and non-tidal monitoring programs
  - Show success stories which can link water quality improvement to management actions
  - Show signs of improvement

  **Secondary Monitoring Objectives:**
  - Climate Change
  - Ocean Acidification

- Are there missing objectives on this list? Do they need modification?
- There are a series of publications coming out that showcase the applications of ConMon and can better inform the conversations regarding this type of data.
- In the case of Maryland, density of sites was a priority. Also they are possibly setting up a sentinel site program.
- ConMon data can help reduce measurement uncertainty in our condition assessments – high temporal and/or spatial data density allows for clarification of conditions and adds accuracy as well as a better understanding of processes at work. But the monitoring must be prioritized and have focus. ConMon can help us determine the additional data that we need to collect and to see how the systems are changing due to inputs from outside the system- such as climate change. There is a question of whether or not our current criteria will still be applicable with climate change.
- By the end of 2016, what needs to be accomplished? There needs to be a strategy in place for supporting implementation of a continuous monitoring network. Having the strategy in place, showing what the community has asked for, allows for justification of funding or program changes.
- If we had a different structure of our monitoring, would it help improve targeting? We need to understand the balance of cost per sample.
- Regarding Dissolved oxygen criteria- The Criteria Assessment Protocols Workgroup had put forth monitoring approaches supporting assessment of criteria attainment. This work is summarized in a technical addendum which is now in front of STAC for a panel review for recommendations. Peter can send the draft to anyone who wants to see it.
- A question was put forward of whether we should use weather networks?
- Question. Is there going to be top down direction on places to focus on for the monitoring program. Answer: We've coordinated with the states as far as assessments, there are allowances for the states to go back and target monitoring to verify accuracy of their assessments.

- For next time: We will summarize discussions and provide an outline on building out the Continuous Monitoring Strategy. Over the next few months, there are research papers coming out that will helpful guidance to building this documentation.

**2:30 STAC Workshop Updates:** *(Mindy Ehrich UMCES)*

*The INWG is working with STAC for a spring 2016 workshop regarding the topic of Integrated Networks – Title: Integrating and Leveraging Monitoring Networks to Support the Assessment of Outcomes in the New Bay Agreement. The goal of this workshop is to develop approaches and recommendations on how to leverage existing CBP and partner monitoring networks, filling data gaps and creating efficiencies for measuring and reporting outcomes in the new Bay Agreement.*

*Example: The Nontidal WQ monitoring network has opportunities to be leveraged for the collection of information on toxic contaminants, stream conditions and brook trout habitat.*

NOTES

- **ACTION:** This workshop is in its planning stage. We want to share the present thoughts and have group input on the agenda outline and potential invitees.

- Mindy highlighted that we are looking at the question of how to better leverage the existing monitoring networks. The workshop is providing a series of approaches evaluating as options/suggestions in how to apply them to create such integrated networks in other areas.
- This workshop will focus on a more regional scale. It will look at the Choptank watershed as a pilot area with which to apply lessons learned when scaling up to the whole Bay watershed.
    - Questions remain for what parameters/outcomes to focus on in this pilot workshop.
- The workshop is looking for a process that we can put in place that can be used in other regions of the Bay, ie: a roundtable approach to integrate networks and agencies, or pooled monitoring approach, to help build better integrated networks.

**3:00 Adjourn**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Mindy Ehrich** | **mehrich@chesapeakebay.net** |
| **Megan Bradburn** | |
| **Julie Vastine** | **vastine@dickinson.edu** |
| **Kevin McGonigal** | **kmcgonigal@srbc.net** |
| **Mike Harnworn** | |
| **Claire Buchanon** | **cbuchan@icprb.org** |
| **Lea Rubin** | **lrubin@iwla.org** |
| **Tom Parham** | **tom.parham@maryland.gov** |
| **Lucretia Brown** | **Lucretia.brown@dc.gov** |
| **Cindy Johnson** | **cindy.johnson@deq.virginia.gov** |
| **James Beckley** | |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Tish Robertson** | **tish.robertson@deq.virginia.gov** |
| **Ken Hyer** | **kenhyer@usgs.gov** |
| **Doug Moyer** | **dlmoyer@usgs.gov** |
| **Anna Mathis** | **amathis@allianceforthebay.org** |
| **Ken Moore** | **moore@vims.edu** |
| **Laura Harris** | |