



Brook Trout Workgroup Project Steering Committee Meeting

Facilitating Brook Trout Outcome Attainability through Coordination with CBP Jurisdictions and Partners

December 1, 2022

Attendance

Project Steering Committee

Stephen Faulkner – (USGS Eastern Ecological Science Center) Brook Trout Workgroup Co-Chair

Katie Ombalski – (Woods and Waters Consulting) Brook Trout Workgroup Co-Chair

Gina Hunt – (MD DNR) Habitat GIT Co-Chair

Katlyn Fuentes – (CRC)

Megan Thyng – (EPA CBP Office)

Contractors

Shawn Rummel – (Trout Unlimited)

Amy Wolfe - (TU)

Matt Mayfield – (TU)

Lori Maloney – (EBTJV Coordinator)

One of the group's first actions was to set the next meeting for December 15, 3-4pm. (Since changed to 11 am; <https://meet.goto.com/384729837>)

Shawn Rummel asked for clarification on the format of the final workplan. Steve Faulkner responded that the plan should lay out what to do, when, how; it can use bullets so long as there is enough text to understand it.

Shawn reviewed the workplan. First, he mentioned that the details get more difficult to outline the further out in time we go, because the next steps rely on results from first steps.

The draft workplan is based around the four goals.

- 1. Identify opportunities for cross-GIT collaborations with other CBP teams (Healthy Watersheds, Fish Passage, Riparian Buffers) on connected actions, e.g., reforestation, aquatic connectivity, land conservation**

- 2. Strengthen communication and coordination with other stakeholders (eg., non-DNR state agencies, other NGOs)**
- 3. Collect and compile existing data from stakeholders and analyze monitoring and implementation data necessary to adequately track progress.**
- 4. Work with the CBP EPA Data Center Team to develop a tracking/reporting application**

These notes mention several important components with discussion points to follow:

- ID broad list of stakeholders, maybe hash out on the 15th.
 - Initial survey to this list; ask about # and approx. type of projects completed between 2016-2022 then we can know the universe of projects, use to select projects for use in analysis, develop draft database, and to ask if we want to pull monitoring data.
 - The involvement with stakeholder groups and other GIT teams and workgroups will be iterative/happen alongside the data sets (below). Some items to engage stakeholders may include quarterly meetings, webinars to update them on all aspects of the project and take questions regarding database. Other GIT teams may be pulled in to see where data can be shared or what similar datasets other teams have been developed.
- Collect and compile existing occupancy data – overall goal have agreement on a baseline that's comparable with 2023 dataset.
 - Reason: if we use 2016 patches we know they are now smaller just because the updated culvert data make patches smaller ('break up' 2016 patches further than they were)
 - Can we use 2016 EBTJV data, what will 2023 data look like, can we roll those back to a common unit such as reach scale occupied/unoccupied.
 - Pull in culvert barrier data and repatch 2016 data
 - Roll in TU's EBTJ conservation portfolio
 - Steve was concerned about TU spending too much time rolling back; he doesn't want the team to re-define the 2016 baseline given that this may happen in 2025. Shawn agreed to touch back in with the steering committee once we've looked to see if and how the data could be made comparable, and then decide how to go forward (esp. if the baseline is not appropriate).
- Project type/location data – work with stakeholders
 - What is a bkt project (gather input from team and stakeholders)
 - TU database development – to be compiled by TU
 - Field Doc
 - EBTJV (Ecosheds) data

- Compile other data and combine into single database from various data sources identified; perform prelim analyses; then pull in project SC and EPA data center team.
- develop recommendations for future database development
- Monitoring data separately

There were questions about database structure and data types

- Are you building a relational database?
 - A: Begin as Excel files. Eventually, relational database would be possible if the excel use becomes cumbersome. Bring in EPA data center at that juncture, decide what elements to retain from individual datasets, make one big dataset Dec – ID broad list of stakeholders, get broad survey out by January. Start getting Data collection framework simultaneously. Hoping by Mid-late Feb, get all populated. Monitoring data will be messier and take longer.
- If monitoring dataset are separate from other data, what will it look like?
 - A: keep initial data separate from project type and location data. Have a column was monitoring complete yes/no and another column what type of data with drop down. Also study design (how many are BACI, CI, post-trt monitoring, etc?) what is useful monitoring data? TU will clarify that project is looking for presence absence and confirmed presence around projects. We can identify the universe of ‘bonus data’ if we pull it during interactions with folks.

Shawn discussed the TU database development and also potential add-on analyses such as land use changes. The Steering Committee felt that others (e.g. Peter Claggett; Chesapeake Commons) have done similar analyses that might be work exploring with other goal teams; Gina can help connect.

The Steering Committee wants to see more detail on the plan to engage. How will the project engage these teams. Gina suggested the project team reach out to state agencies and when talking to people, ask ‘who else is important’ to reach out to.

Lori will start to develop the stakeholder list and contacts, as google doc to collaborate on. Shawn – TU has a good list of state and federal agency folks. (see https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1u1eyUbh9N5sMjeiTnvGE2ip56K0oIEy_zsxAcUz5loE/edit#gid=0)

Outline in more detail for the 15th, we will collaborate on google doc and look at together on the 15th.