

## 2016 Chesapeake Bay Criteria Addendum Review Questions:

The Chesapeake Bay Program (CBP) partnership, through the STAR Team and the CAP Workgroup, requests an independent scientific peer review that directly addresses the following questions. The review panel is strongly encouraged to also make recommendations for future work by the CBP partnership that build on these questions or are related to the scientific or management issues raised in the review. The review panel will be provided with the relevant documentation and will be given direct access to the involved CBP partners, via webinar format, to facilitate the review. The review panel will generate a written report addressing the questions. The partnership will then produce a written response to the review.

For each of the six chapters, please answer the following questions. Given the purpose of some chapters (e.g., chapters 4 and 5) are more 'documentation for the record' in nature, not all the questions need to be addressed for each of the chapters.

1. Please comment on the overall appropriateness of the approach taken and the level of documentation provided given the document's objective (as an addendum) of filling in the gaps (when used in combination with the original criteria documentation) of providing the three states and the District with a complete set of guidance for assessing attainment of all their adopted previously published Chesapeake Bay dissolved oxygen, water clarity/underwater bay grasses, and chlorophyll a criteria.
2. How justified are the recommended criteria assessment procedures, given the approach used and data available?
3. Please comment on the scientific rigor of the methods used and whether application of the criteria assessment procedures will lead to assessment of attainment in regard to achieving conditions protective of aquatic life.
4. Are there any additional technical data or types of scientific information that should be included in the document and, if so, what are they and how would they help improve the scientific rigor of the methods?
5. Given anticipated continued advances in estuarine monitoring techniques and capabilities as well as continued evolution of statistical science, what future alternative or enhanced criteria assessment procedures should the Chesapeake Bay Program partners consider developing and adopting into the future?

## Informal Questions:

The current document contains more informal guidance that highlights ***some specific elements of the technical document on which the CBP is especially interested in feedback***. These are:

1. The scientific bases for applying the Conditional Attainment approach as a method of stating cross-scale habitat protection using a single scale measurement (e.g., Does meeting a decision threshold value for a 30-day mean dissolved oxygen concentration provide protection for meeting the 7-day mean criterion when we do not have direct measurements sufficient to compute a 7-day mean?)
2. The scientific basis for recommending an option for subdividing (sub-segmenting) 3 habitat zones in the open water designated use of Chesapeake Bay that supports dissolved oxygen criteria attainment assessments.
3. The options laid out for assessing instantaneous minimum criteria to state habitat protection in the open water designated use.
4. The clarity of the document's communications with regard to:
  - a. the alignment of the criteria with Bay grass goals;
  - b. the interim decision rules on application of the BIBI;
  - c. the guidance provided to nontraditional partners for collecting regulatory compliant dissolved oxygen data; and
  - d. the basis of measuring and reporting progress towards water quality standards attainment using the multi-metric water quality standards attainment indicator.