



Climate Resiliency Workgroup (CRWG) Meeting

Monday, May 14, 2018

10:00 AM –3:00 PM Full Workgroup

Conference Line: 202-991-0477 Code: 9037008

Adobe Connect: <http://epawebconferencing.acms.com/crwg> (enter as a guest)

Meeting Materials:

https://www.chesapeakebay.net/what/event/climate_resiliency_workgroup_in_person_meeting_may_2018

CBPO Location: Joe Macknis Memorial Conference Room (Fish Shack)

AGENDA

Thematic Focus: Climate Resiliency Strategy Review

10:00 **Welcome, Introductions & Announcements** (Co-Chair Mark Bennett, USGS and Co-Chair Erik Meyers, The Conservation Fund)

Cooperative is in the planning marsh resiliency summit in early 2019, with a focus on policy implications, adaptation strategies, and state of marshes.

10:05 **Indicator Climate Change Indicator Project** (Peter Tango, USGS, Sargon deJesus ERG, and Laura Drescher, EPA)
Objective: Provide an update on the status of the twenty-one draft climate change indicator implementation plans; identify additional CRWG members to serve as “expert” reviewers for select plans; and discuss process to prioritize indicators for future development.

Support material: [Indicator Implementation Plan](#)

Peter tango gave an update on the climate change indicator project. The top eight indicators are the priority indicators to be completed by the end of September by ERG. There is a checklist within the document as well. Proposed next step is to ask for fatal flaw review by the CRWG to be incorporated into each of the implementation plan. **Asking for workgroup members’ comments sent to Laurel Abowd abowd.laurel@epa.gov by May 31st, 2018.** Questions about the any of the indicators should be sent to Sargon de Jesus. Laura added that this review is for the workgroup members to raise any gaps or further implementation plans. Staffers will send out an email shortly incorporating the deadlines and documents.

Discussion:

- Jen asked the form of commenting. Laura responded track changes in the word document will be better.
- Mark added that review the indicators that the workgroup members interest in and add comments on.
- Fredricka asked for any clarification on the implementation strategies
- Jennifer DeMooy asked if the document included outreach strategy. Laura responded this doesn't include any outreach strategy, but the development of the indicators will be published on the Chesapeake Bay Progress. Targeted research will be next step.
- Zoe added that some of the indicators have data available right now but some of them needs further data collection in the future.
- Mark asked who will provide final comments on the project. Laura responded that Status and Indicators Workgroup which is coordinated by Peter Tango will be the lead and staffers and coordinators within the Bay Program. We will also provide a final presentation to MB.
- Mark commented that some of the data is from jurisdiction input but we don't necessary have a lot of jurisdiction participations. Laura responded that she typically works with staffers within each workgroup. If the staffers have any data update, they would let her know.
- Laura added that we will have a better idea and plan with Peter and GIS team onboard. A couple of the indicators are related with EPA climate change and some of them are closely related to the CBP.
- Peter commented that working with EPA data coordinators, once they updated the dataset from their end, we should be able to see on the webpage.
- Mark asked when will these indicators will be finalized on the webpage. Laura responded by the end of September. They are working with John Wolf and content managers by the end of this month to get a finalized date.

10:30

Climate Resiliency Logic Table and Outcome Workplans (Mark Bennett, USGS)

Objective: An initial draft of the Climate Resiliency SRS Logic Table and Outcome Workplans will be presented, followed by a facilitated discussion among workgroup members to generate input to complete the template.

Support Materials:

- [Draft SRS Quarterly Meeting Logic Table Climate Resiliency-Monitoring and Assessment](#)
- [Draft SRS Quarterly Meeting Logic Table Climate Resiliency-Adaptation](#)

The focus of this meeting is to determine the ask to the MB during the SRS presentation.

Discussion:

- Jennifer Dindinger asked what the workgroup's role in adaption as opposed to the adaptation response workgroup. Zoe responded that the adaptation response workgroup is within the Maryland Department of Environment. She added that since our workgroup goal is very broad, for the next two years we will be focus on adaptation and we can get feedback from MB on this strategy. There are good and bad related to that since the watershed is very big and diverse. Now is the time to focus on the smaller goal.

- Jennifer asked if MB can work with larger funders to align some of their funding efforts. Mark responded that this also align with STAR's goal.
- Mark also added it is also important to see what Workgroup members are interested in so that we can get more participations. When filling out these documents, we should focus on what we have done so far.
- Mark commented that for the first two years, the workgroup is focused on monitoring and assessment. Zoe added that the first two-year workplan was very ambitious and there are a lot of reasons behind the unfinished workplan.\
- Fredricka asked what the MB's focus on adaptation. Mark responded that it would be closely related to water quality. Zoe responded that MB is high level and the board members are very diverse and they may not be familiar with the climate adaptation but coastal flooding, living shorelines and resources management needs such as oyster etc will be their interests.
- Fredricka commented that Climate impact on BMP will be a good start since it covers the entire watershed. The climate change in adaptation is more of a societal question and we can work on how to relate it to the CBP Climate change modeling.
- Zoe responded the goal is not intended to be larger than the water quality. The partnership over the last two years is focused on mid-point assessment and is asked the workgroup to support this. However, we should first work to satisfy this goal and then also work on what the members' interests in.
- Jennifer Dindinger proposed to go back to the minutes or the lists of the priorities to see what folks are interested in. She added that there are data gap problem with the indicators for Climate resilient BMPs. Susan commented that indicators don't have to be quantitative. David's proposal is focused on that purpose as well.

A document regarding the CRWG future meeting key action and priorities was presented. Zoe added that a research need was updated during the Dec 2017.

- Fredricka asked about the method to communicate the data collected during Midpoint Assessment to the community and start a conversation on what the expectation on changes on the landscape. This can bring awareness of the climate change with the Chesapeake Bay. We would need a robust evaluation on this.
- Zoe mentioned the Wetland Workgoup's workplan focuses on increasing landowners' educations in wetland. Maybe our strategy can be somewhat similar to that: to target education and outreach.
- Fredricka asked if we had focused on adaption and what adaptation was on people's mind.
- Zoe mentioned the living shorelines campaign in VA and ongoing concern regarding the hard structure. Maybe there is need to look at the living shoreline registration. Molly added that in VA, 90% will be living shoreline appropriate, but people still prefer hard structure. This is related with registration and education. Adrian thinks it's more related to the education.
- Mark responded that education specifically related to the living shoreline can be our focus. We can ask MB for additional resources.
- Jennifer commented that we don't know what percentage of the overall harden shoreline in the Chesapeake Bay. She also added that definitions are needed with education in living shoreline. There are more complicated barriers with this process.

- Zoe proposed that indicators are needed as well. Peter added that shoreline condition is within the Implementation plan.
- Molly agreed that education is a narrow term and there is missing information with modeling and prices. We encountered problems when we try to determine the costs
- Elizabeth asked if the public understand the importance of wetland migration corridors. Jen Dindinger agreed more education is needed but private owners might be confused with the importance of the wetland.
- Fredricka asked if PA is interested in shoreline conditions. Zoe responded stream health, climate change's impact on agriculture, and flood plain management are their focus.
- Fredricka summarized the ideas that the workgroup members proposed: stream information; climate change in BMP, shoreline respond to climate change and its adaptation policy. Science is not entirely settled but it has greater societal impacts in terms of flooding.
- Zoe summarized the workgroup focus in these areas shoreline conditions, climate change impact on BMP, inland and urban flooding, and raised the questions on stream health condition. Peter explained stream health condition is more related with the precipitation and storm events, and protecting species and habitat.
- **The workgroup agreed on these four topics will be the focus within the adaption goal:**
 - **Shoreline condition and response;**
 - **Climate change on BMP;**
 - **Inland and urban flooding;**
 - **Stream health condition.**
- Zoe added that we need to determine to action under each of these four topics.
- Mark commented that we need to bring the community and asked what their needs are.
- Fredricka suggested when sending out the email we need to emphasize adaption piece.
- Rebecca added that we should incorporate Communication Workgroup in the outreach and education work.
- Jennifer DeMooy commented that we can focus on assessment of performance and effectiveness of established restoration projects and we may get a better idea of perceived performance and variability of climate change. A lot of people can be incorporated in this discussion
- Zoe commented that these actions can be seek help from STAC
- Mark commented that in rewriting the management plan, the logic table will make more sense
- Zoe suggested looking at the management approach or maybe revise on the management approaches.
- Zoe commented that management approach 2 under adaptation is too abroad need revision.
- Mark commented that we need narrower focus to have action items that can be completed within two years.
- Zoe commented that assessment was not performed because some of the tasks were not completed.
- Management approach 4 is too abroad. Adjusted it to help craft template approaches to get in adaptation and institutional approach.

- Mark commented that Workgroup will not perform on the ground project but the jurisdiction representative will do the projects but they are represented in the workgroup. Must distinguish what is the responsibility of the workgroup, and the responsibility of the partners.
- Jen Dindinger added her possible contribution with providing workshops.
- Jen Demooy commented that tracking and implementation are both important but usually performed by different parties.
- Susan suggested we can adjust it to “support implementation action”, and focus on the Best practices and support communication across the workgroup.
- Mark commented for management approach number 5: needs more focuses action
- Workshop maybe invite practitioners and share their best practices whether education and knowledge change and implementation plan
- Ashley Gordon added that a survey was done showing that local government has a hard time measuring effectiveness of their outreach. So a workshop on metrics and behavior change would be helpful.

12:45 Continue Discussion on Logic Table

- Jen suggested to incorporate the response to the response of the STAC workshop into the workplan
- Mark clarified that that response is from the CBP, not directly the Climate Resiliency Workgroup. This is the big reason for why those responses are sent out to everyone.
- Jen asked we should assign the percentage of time to each project. If we plan for it and in case other things come up. Mark said we should be conservative in terms of determining what the workgroup will be doing.
- Peter added that putting four workshops under each of the topic will be very stretching.
- Mark said we may not need workshop for each of the topic.
- Zoe said STAC workshop comes with funding and a large amount of work. We can bring experts in less formal platform. However, STAC workshop can help make changes since the STAC can make recommendations to the Bay Program.
- Mark said we can't make our workplan around STAC workshop since they may not accept our proposal.
- Melissa asked the four topics role in the logic table. Zoe said the next two-year workplan will be focused on these four areas. We will have targeted actions under these four topics. Mark added that some of these topics fall under monitoring and some fall under adaptation. Zoe said we need to determine the actions under each of the topic and fill in the workplan which will be developed after the SRS presentation. We need MB's approval and feedback before we develop the workplan.
- Zoe commented that if we want to gather support in improving stream health in NY and WV, and considering these two states did not sign the climate change agreement. One of the ask will be ask representation from these two states. Mark added that they need to incorporate Climate change in their WIP3. Two states don't participate in our workgroup and they also need help in determining

- Rebecca commented that Communication Workgroup also experienced such issue and they also find it effective in terms of asking MB to increase more participants with certain state.
- Jennifer DeMooy commented that encourage representation in other states but travel is a factor. Maybe we can make the STAC meeting location in states further north.
- Zoe suggested continuing to pursue the indicator project over the two years through GIT funding.
- Mark commented that Toxics Workgroup did not go through the logic tables as a group but they focus on the next steps as a group.
- Mark added that an email will be sent out to the workgroup to give unattended members opportunities to raise questions and concern and then during next meeting we will be narrowing the ask.

2:00 2018 Chesapeake Bay Program Goal Team Funding (Mark Bennett, USGS)

Objective: GIT Funding Ideas: Goal Team Funding for 2018 will once again become available, with funding for projects within the \$25-\$75k range. Proposals will be due around the end of May. Past projects for the CRWG include the Climate Smart Decision Framework, the Climate Change Indicator Projects, and the CBP Climate Data and Mapping Repository. Ideas were discussed at March's meeting, listed below. Please be prepared to discuss these ideas further, and/or other project ideas for this year's funding.

Support Materials:

- GIT Funding Proposal: Climate-resilient bmp indicator project
- GIT Funding Proposal: Maryland LS Survey 051018

Two proposals from David and Jim were received for the GIT funding. Workgroup members will be asked to provide feedback for these two proposals to the authors between now and June so that they will be prepared for July meeting. The deadline for proposal is July 20.

Discussion:

- Mark added that David's proposal could be even more broad to include more than just the one indicator he mentions. Also, our four topics of focus discussed earlier should be solidified first, before we chose these funding priorities to submit.
- Zoe suggested that green infrastructure and shoreline condition indicator implementation plans should be pulled up as well for these discussions.
- Mark suggested to start the July call with the discussions of their proposals.
- Zoe suggested including Delaware, VA and MD in the discussion of the shoreline erosion. Jen responded that in DE, all the living shorelines are out of the watershed.
- Elizabeth asked if more than one proposal will be funded. Mark responded that our top priority will always be funded. It is possible that we have more than two proposals funded. What is the funding amount range? Peter responded 25K to 75K.

Next Meeting Dates:

June 18, 2018: 1:30-3:30 PM (conference call)

July 16, 2018: 1:30-3:30 PM (conference call)

Meeting participants:

Zoe Johnson

Fredricka Moser

Peter Tango

Laura Drescher

Nicole Carlozo

Jennifer DiMooy

Jen Didinger

Elizabeth Andrews

Rebecca

Cuiyin Melissa

Ashley Gordon

Jim George

Molly Mitchell

Sargon de Jesus

Susan Julius

Melissa Merritt

Curt Dell

Taryn Sudol

Mark Bennet