



Climate Resiliency Workgroup Meeting

Wednesday, January 27, 2021; 1:30 PM – 4:00 PM

Webinar*: <https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/175843125>

Password: CRWG

Join by phone: +1 (408) 650-3123; **Access code:** 175-843-125

*If you are joining by webinar, please open the webinar first, then dial in.

Meeting materials:

https://www.chesapeakebay.net/what/event/climate_resiliency_workgroup_crwg_january_2021_meeting

This meeting will be recorded for internal use to assure the accuracy of meeting notes.

Action Items

- ✓ Consider suggestions on edits to the Charter:
 - Specifically state the Monitoring and Assessment and Adaptation Outcomes.
 - Include a section on how decisions are made and documented (“Procedures”).
 - Include “connector” as a role for workgroup members.
 - Include a mission statement about how the workgroup plans to meet the outcomes.
 - Include a documentation section that provides links/copies of the Management Strategy and Logic & Action Plan to help users understand what the workgroup is going to do to meet the outcomes.
 - Include a sentence about how climate will impact the CBP’s ability to meet all agreement goals.
 - Document how information is disseminated among the group.
 - Outlining what role the CRWG is serving for the other CBP GITs.
 - Adding agency representation (such as USGS, USFWS) under core membership.
 - Structure the workgroup with smaller teams that report back to the larger workgroup.
- ✓ Draft options of workgroup structure (smaller teams/frequency of meetings/roles/etc.) and share with members to discuss during future CRWG meeting.
- ✓ Draft a mission statement to share with the workgroup.
- ✓ Discuss modification of Logic Factors at next meeting along with the Management Strategy. Note from coordinator – planning discussion during March meeting.
- ✓ Consider suggestions on edits to the Logic & Action Plan:
 - Include “addressing emerging issues” as one of the action items. It could have actions to bring in speakers to increase understanding of emerging issue but not having the workgroup develop actions to address the emerging issue.
 - Adding a performance target to the “increase capacity to better understand sea level rise impacts to habitats and their ecosystem services” stating the CRWG will invite subject matter experts to present information and results to better understand impacts.

- Make distinctions on which actions the workgroup wants to take full responsibility (possibly include names) and actions they are consulting or advising.
- Remove language “provide estimates of associated costs,” from action on a BMP research agenda.
- Jason Dubow will provide alternative language to the action stating to expand resource capacity to implement climate adaptation projects.
- Expanding to other topics in the blue carbon action item but having the workgroup only serving in the connector and facilitator role.

AGENDA

1:30 PM **Welcome, Meeting Overview and Introductions, *Chair Mark Bennett (USGS)***

1:35 PM **Workgroup Direction, *Mark Bennett & Julie Reichert-Nguyen (NOAA), and Sherry Witt (GDIT, facilitator)***

The Climate Resiliency Workgroup (CRWG) is tasked with achieving two major outcomes in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement related to climate resiliency: Monitoring & Assessment and Adaptation. We will brainstorm and discuss operating principles of the workgroup in addressing the climate resilience outcomes and how best to support the climate resilience efforts of other workgroups within the Chesapeake Bay Program Partnership and the watershed. Results from the pre-meeting survey data will be presented to help facilitate the discussion. Ideas from the discussion will be used to help develop a workgroup charter to share with the Management Board and Goal Implementation Teams.

Discussion Questions:

- How would we like the workgroup to operate in achieving our outcomes and supporting the climate resilience efforts of other workgroups?
- How can the workgroup activities benefit member organizations and support CBP Partnership goals around building climate resilience?
- What scientific/technical assistance can we provide to other workgroups and watershed partners?

Materials: [*Results from workgroup membership poll, example charter from Status and Trends Workgroup, and CRWG draft charter template \(last updated 1.26.21\)*](#)

Requested Workgroup Action: *Inputs for the draft CRWG Charter*

Breck Sullivan went over some of the results from the survey. In terms of what role CRWG members are interested in serving, it is split mainly between core workgroup members and interested parties. As listed in the survey, core workgroup members will attend workgroup meetings, participate in smaller teams to assist with CRWG-supported projects and efforts, identify collaborative opportunities between the Chesapeake Bay Program Partnership and their organization, and share information and knowledge. An interested party is interested in receiving emails with workgroup updates and learning and sharing

information during workgroup meetings. These specific roles may change while the workgroup members edit the charter. Over 90% of the workgroup members are most interested in helping out with the adaptation outcome which connects well with the focus CRWG leadership would like to take efforts in the next two years. The interest in the adaptation outcome is highlighted through the amount of interest in specific CRWG projects that would help reach that outcome such as the Bay Climate Resilience Scorecard, Local Government Adaptation, and Natural/green infrastructure strategies. The workgroup members also provided helpful ideas on other topics they are interested in the workgroup supporting. Some of the ideas such as blue carbon, saltwater intrusion, and marsh migration with sea level rise are already incorporated into the updated Logic & Action Plan and the CRWG Science needs. Julie Reichert-Nguyen provided more details on what providing technical assistance would entail for a workgroup member. She stated this is something CRWG leadership was considering the workgroup could engage in with local/regional groups in the Chesapeake Bay watershed. An example is that she sits on the Working with Local Government Workgroup with Envision the Choptank. They are looking at ways to engage in restoration projects especially around climate change, but they do not have the expertise, so Julie has been consulting them during their meetings. Some of these workgroups know the CRWG exists, but they don't know if CRWG members can provide technical assistance which can range from helping them identify resiliency efforts to put in their proposal, helping with writing grants, and providing support from an advisory capacity. When working through the charter, Julie would like to know if CRWG members see this as a potential function for the workgroup. Other survey results focused more on the amount of time and when the workgroup would meet. A majority (71%) of members would like to participate less than 4 hours per month in CRWG activities, but also most members (54%) would like to meet monthly. Julie Reichert-Nguyen commented the workgroup currently meets monthly, and the meetings are mostly structured as information sharing, some theme meetings, and bringing in experts on other topics to inform workgroup members. The information sharing is crucial, but there are a lot of requests for workgroup members to consult on projects and serve on steering committees. Multiple workgroup members currently sit on the Bay Climate Resilience Scorecard steering committee and others have voiced their interest in assisting with the Marsh Migration GIT-Funded steering committee. Julie thinks serving as an advisory role would be useful for the workgroup, but this would take up time while also meeting monthly so it would require more time for participating in the CRWG. Julie is then interested if there is another way to structure the meetings and workgroups to accommodate this switch such as meeting in small teams monthly and then meet with the entire workgroup every other month or quarterly to report out on the projects or initiatives. Sherry Whitt said there might be a way to blend the information sharing meeting with project oriented information especially as certain requests come up which can be documented in the charter.

Sherry Whitt went to the charter next to describe how it will contain information on who the workgroup is and what they do. It will be extremely helpful for new members and for working across Chesapeake Bay Program (CBP) Goal Implementation Teams (GITs).

Jason Dubow suggested specifically stating that monitoring assessment and adaptation are the two outcomes for the workgroup. He also suggested clarifying what is existing language from the Management Strategy and Logic & Action Plan and what is new language for the charter.

Katie Matta suggested reversing the sentences in the first paragraph of the charter.

Scott Phillips stated for core membership there should also be a bullet for "agency representation (such as USGS, USFWS)" in addition to jurisdictional representation

In terms of other roles workgroup members could serve, Nicole Carlozo stated they could serve as a "connector" to other experts in our regions. Julie said that sounds like a great role to consider for the workgroup.

Bruce Vogt suggested a section on how decisions are made and documented. Sherry Whitt agreed with Bruce and said anything concerning procedures for the workgroup should be included in the section.

Scott mentioned there is a mission statement that is a goal from the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement, but there should be a mission statement stating what the workgroup is going to do to meet those goals. Sherry Whitt stated there could be a section on workgroup documentation that includes the Management Strategy and Logic & Action Plan. Scott suggested the "mission" of the CRWG is to coordinate efforts and build capacity to make progress toward the Climate Resiliency Goal and associated outcomes in the Watershed Agreement. The CRWG follows the strategic directions of its Management Strategy, and carry out activities in its Logic & Action Plan.

Nicole Carlozo stated including a sentence about how climate will impact our ability to meet all agreement goals. Julie Reichert-Nguyen said she might have a visual for this, but she also thought it would go under operating principals where it describes how their work benefits other CBP goals and the projects of the workgroup member's organizations. An example of this is the upcoming summer intern for blue carbon. The CRWG needs a science review to understand wetland restoration and submerged aquatic vegetation inclusion in existing crediting protocols. CRWG leadership reached out to workgroup members if anyone was interested in mentoring an intern. A workgroup member stepped up at VIMS because they have work that could benefit from this intern. Julie would like to identify other opportunities to focus on collaborative projects that benefit both the workgroup and partner institutions.

On the topic of activities benefiting member organizations, workgroup members participated in a menti question, "How can workgroup activities to build

resilience benefit member organizations and support CBP Partnership goals?” Results to this question can be found [here](#).

Elizabeth Andrews stated the workgroup should ask partner organizations to help profile the work at their events too, or help support the workgroup’s research needs.

Multiple workgroup members commented on menti to try and connect information among the group and other organizations. Sherry Whitt asked Julie Reichert-Nguyen to explain how the group can be notified of what is going on, where they can participate, and how they can document the process in the charter. Julie stated she sends requests through email, but it might be useful to have member organizations present their priorities to the workgroup. Mark Bennett said this is how they have always done it because it is the timeliest way to share information. Molly Mitchell thinks the emailing works.

Bruce Vogt thinks win-win situations need to be based on joint priorities and commitment of resources between CBP, agencies, and partner organizations. CRWG needs to be cautious about being viewed as a means by which other parts of program meet all their climate objectives. CRWG members should serve in a consultation role, but the real lead is the other GIT addressing their climate need. This should be outlined in the charter.

Sean Corson said he agrees with Scott that creating a mission would be good. Including roles and responsibilities makes sense, along with operating principles. The Scope of Work seems out of place in the mission statement. It is unclear how it connects to the two-year workplan and seems granular for a charter. If it is not the same as Logic & Action Plan it will be confusing, but if it is the same, it is repetitive. Sherry suggested instead of putting it as scope of work to title it as workgroup’s function. Members looking at this charter should clearly understand how they can contribute and participate in the workgroup.

Sherry Whitt asked whether the charter should include the role of advisor. Julie mentioned not many workgroup members selected they were interested as serving as an advisor on the survey. She would like to get workgroup member’s input on the CRWG serving from an advisory capacity on cross-GITs efforts. Jason Dubow said it sounds like there is a conflict with what other groups expect from this workgroup and what the CRWG can provide. There is this larger issue on what is the expectation from the Management Board and others for the CRWG. He asked if they know those expectations and if they can we talk with the groups about what the CRWG can and cannot provide to them. Julie asked Sean Corson, a Management Board member, what he thinks is the role of the CRWG. Sean said that is what the exercise today is by identifying actions in the Logic & Action Plan. There are about 18 actions along with additional requests which is too much for the CRWG. What the CRWG should do is provide a prioritized list of actions that the workgroup can handle independently to serve as a basis for any other programmatic requests. For example, if the Principal Staff Committee

(PSC) has a request, the CRWG could quickly show which projects they were working on to decide which one needs to be dropped to fulfill the request or inform them that they cannot start the request until they are done with one of those projects.

Scott Phillips, as a Management Board member, said he had contrary perspective from Sean's view. He did not see the mission today to shorten the actions but to find more capacity to carry out the actions. Climate change actions are only going to grow so they need to think how to expand and grow capacity.

Mark Bennett stated the issue of capacity was brought up with the Management Board during the Quarterly Progress Meeting. The Management Board asked the CRWG to identify projects they could not tackle due to capacity. He commented it natural for other CBP workgroups to come to the CRWG for input issues concerning climate, and hopefully the CRWG can connect them with the correct expert. It would be hard to remove the CRWG from the advisory role within the CBP.

Kristin Saunders agrees with Sean Corson and Scott Phillips. The CRWG are the subject matter experts and most in tune to what is happening local and watershed wide. In the Strategy Review System, the workplan started out being enormous, and people realized they couldn't accomplish everything in 2 years. They have learned it is helpful to know given the expertise of the workgroup what resources the workgroup has and then identify the gaps.

Sean Corson stated he agrees with Kristin Saunders. Scott and his points are not mutually exclusive. He would like to see the work plan result in a list of actions that the group is committed to work on. As new issues emerge, the workgroup, STAR, Management Board and PSC can look at that and evaluate if an action underway should be dropped to support an emerging priority, or if capacity should be added.

Nicole Carlozo stated she liked the idea of keeping an "emerging issues" list and identifying interested parties for each emerging issue (When interest reaches a certain threshold, the issue becomes a priority.).

Scott Phillips suggested that an emerging issue action in the work plan list is a worthwhile idea. For the Toxic Contaminant Research work plan, they have "addressing emerging issues" as one of the work elements. Has actions to bring in speakers to increase understanding of emerging issue but not having the workgroup having to develop actions to address the emerging issue.

On the topic of resources available, the workgroup filled out the menti question, "What scientific/technical assistance can we provide to other workgroups and watershed partners?" Results to this question can be found [here](#).

Mark Bennett said the CRWG is mainly taking the role as the connector/facilitator. He stated some workgroup members may have the expertise and capacity to provide scientific assistance, but generally the CRWG is trying to make connections with someone who is looking for information and data with those who can provide it.

Sherry Whitt discussed other potential roles for the CRWG. She explained that a Thought Leader is an informed, go-to person on a particular topic of interest in the workgroup. They are a trusted source that can lead, act, and inspire innovative thoughts. They would provide assistance or provide ways to turn ideas into actions. Jason Dubow suggested calling them subject matter expert. Julie said this person would take the initiative to host small teams on actions and projects in the Logic & Action Plan and take the lead to report back to the workgroup.

Bruce Vogt stated earlier in the meeting that Julie offered a suggestion to develop smaller working groups under CRWG. He has seen this structure work elsewhere and would support it here. Each smaller team has leadership and accountability for their assigned actions. They can develop products, recommendations, etc. for consideration by CRWG. This structure, if adopted by team, could go into the charter with a general description about using small teams to get work done and link them to the decision-making process (suggested earlier).

Workgroup members answered the last menti question, “How should the CRWG operate in achieving our outcomes and supporting the climate resilience efforts of other workgroups. Results to this question can be found [here](#).

2:35 PM Focusing on the Next Two Years - Assessing our Efforts, Gaps & Recommended Actions through the Strategy Review System (SRS), Sherry Witt (GDIT, facilitator)

We will review the goals of the SRS - CBP’s adaptive management process – and its supporting documents as we begin the second 2-year cycle of the SRS. This presentation will lay the framework for the Logic & Action Plan review agenda topic.

Current Factors:

Monitoring & Assessment

- Scientific Capabilities
- Geographic extent/variability of the watershed
- Complexity of the Monitoring Program

Note: Merged Multiple Stressors factor with Scientific Capabilities factor

Adaptation

- Stakeholder Engagement
- Capacity
- Authority
- Guidance
- Coordination

Note: Incorporated variable approaches in with Guidance factor

2:45 PM

Overview of November/December Management Board Requests, Mark Bennett

Mark will summarize the follow up actions from the Quarterly Progress Meeting (QPM) Management Board requests and lead discussion with workgroup members on how best to address ongoing requests.

Materials: [*Identified Management Board Requests from the QPM Presentation*](#)

Requested Workgroup Action: *Next steps to address the MB requests*

- Request to Management Board: Identify potential stakeholder users for scorecard feedback meetings.
 - This request was completed.
- Request to Management Board: Identify utility behind climate indicators being selected.
 - There are currently 7 indicators. They were adopted because data was readily available, but they need to be maintained. It takes work to maintain them and the CRWG Coordinator cannot update all of them. Questions to consider include how often the indicators should be updated and which ones the CRWG should prioritize for development/maintenance. They are asking the Management Board to help the CRWG prioritize the list.
- Request to Management Board: Establish funding plan for research agenda on climate change impacts to BMP performance to inform needed resilience actions.
 - This research is beyond capacity for the CRWG. It was requested for the CRWG to then create a list of which ones have the greatest need for climate change research.
- Request to Management Board: Support more staff resources for CRWG.
 - The nature of climate is that it impacts almost all the other outcomes. There are a lot of other active groups trying to build resiliency in the watershed, and since the CRWG leadership is stretched thin to fulfill all the requests from the other GITS, the workgroup will identify primary and secondary actions and estimate staff support needed to accomplish in a 2-year timeframe.
 - Jason Dubow stated some tasks can only be done by dedicated funding or a dedicated team. He asked if it is possible to tease out which tasks require much more substantial effort than hiring more staff compared to more time from other organizations.
 - Mark Bennett stated while they finalize the Logic & Action Plan to make sure it is the right size, and they need to consider what help they can get from other workgroup members. CRWG leadership is aware workgroup members have other jobs so they want to make sure we do not reflect actions in the workplan that the CRWG does not have the capacity to do. Julie mentioned

CRWG has already tried to tease out what the workgroup can accomplish in the next two years with the current capacity.

3:00 PM Confirming the Climate Resiliency Logic & Action Plan and Introduction to DEIJ Inclusion in SRS materials, *Julie Reichert-Nguyen & Tuana Phillips (EPA CBPO, DEIJ Coordinator)*

We will discuss the workgroup's focus for the next two years, modifications to the logic factors, review of actions, and explore inclusion of Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Justice (DEIJ) considerations. The Diversity Team will present on strategies to consider DEIJ for workgroup actions. CRWG leadership will receive feedback from the workgroup on agreed upon priority activities for the CRWG to focus on during the next 2 years, identify partner resources that could support activities, and identify if there are any key actions missing.

Discussion Questions:

- Do you agree with the modifications to the logic factors? Are there any concerns or alternative options?
- Do you agree with the actions recommended for the workgroup to primarily focus on during the next 2 years? Are there any key actions missing that should be a top priority during the next 2 years?
- Are there actions where we can incorporate Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Justice (DEIJ) considerations? If so, then how?
- Are there member organizations or partner resources that can support primary actions or secondary activities?

Materials: [Draft Post-QPM Logic & Action Plan](#), [DEIJ Factsheet](#), [DEIJ Presentation](#), [Logic & Action Plan Presentation](#)

Requested Workgroup Action: [Input on the updated CRWG Logic & Action Plan](#)

Ivan Hernandez and Tuana Phillips discussed the definitions of DEIJ (outlined in the presentation) and examples of climate related projects. The first example is the Targeted Outreach for Green Infrastructure (TOGI) in Vulnerable Areas which is a CBP GIT-Funding project. The project targeted underserved communities with valuable habitat and high risk of impact from climate change. They used GIS to help narrow down the number of communities. Some of the layers included sea level rise and EJ demographic indicators. This example can be used to show how to incorporate DEIJ considerations on deciding where to target projects in the watershed. There is also the tool Environmental Justice and Equity Dashboard to use and incorporate the equity lens in projects. Another example is Building a Bay-wide Scorecard to track climate resilience to track climate resilience activities. The scorecard will include an equity metric to the scorecard. The final example is the 2020 Local Government Forum on climate resiliency. The forum brought together subject matter experts and local elected officials to explore topics including climate and environmental justice.

Julie moved the topic of discussing the modification to the Logic Factors to the next meeting.

Julie first discussed the primary actions on the CRWG Logic & Action Plan. The majority of the primary actions were carried over from the last Logic & Action Plan or current work the CRWG is doing. Most of them also have resources dedicated to them.

The first primary action is designing monitoring and maintenance protocols to report on and implement new climate change indicators. Nicole Carlozo stated it would be helpful to reiterate the primary audience of these indicators. Mark Bennett commented when going through the process of identifying the highest priority indicators, they will need to put the Bay Water Temperature indicator in the mix. Taryn Sudol suggested to match up indicator performance. Bruce Vogt supports this particular aspect. Importance of bay water temperature is connecting the change in temperature to the living resource response. Identifying the utility is most important because it is common knowledge that the physical change of temperature is rising, but it needs to be connected to the ecological change. Mark Bennett stated that connecting the ecological change is where other workgroups would support the development. Julie stated she sees the CRWG maintaining the physical indicators, but they would have to collaborate with corresponding workgroups when connecting it to ecological or community impacts. Taryn Sudol suggested to match up indicator performance with DEIJ map layers, which may help show environmental injustices. Julie Reichert-Nguyen said that is a good suggestion from a utility standpoint.

The second primary action is to maintain the indicators already on Chesapeake Progress. Julie Reichert-Nguyen stated they will discuss with the Status and Trends Workgroup on updating the timeframes of indicators because climate indicators will not show a drastic change annually. Scott Phillips stated under performance target “d” it should be USGS not USGS PA Water Science. Jason Dubow stated this activity is dependent on the workgroup, but it seems misplaced. The CRWG role would be better to connect those with the data to those in the CBP who need it. Julie stated they collaborate with an EPA team for the current indicators. The indicators are on ChesapeakeProgress to demonstrate the progress towards the CBP outcomes so there is some expectation that workgroups would provide indicators if they are responsible for outcomes.

Another primary action is to increase capacity to better understand sea level rise impacts to habitats and their ecosystem services. The performance target for this action is a GIT-Funded project lead by the Wetland workgroup and supported by the CRWG. Workgroup members requested to be involved in this project to some extent at earlier CRWG meetings.

Scott Phillips asked how to reflect the other ongoing efforts that inform the action. There are multiple entities already looking at this action, and those partners are a part of workgroup. Julie stated that if there is the climate related activities section of the Logic & Action Plan that the workgroup can include those efforts in that section. This action is one that the CRWG will take a lead role in making sure it gets done. There are a lot of efforts that partners are supporting,

but CRWG leadership is trying to first capture what the workgroup can support and carry out. Scott stated he was a little confused since some of the other efforts are being done by workgroup members, and they could provide results. Julie stated they could allow those groups present at workgroup meetings. Scott suggested adding an appendix to the Management Strategy of existing work being done by agencies on topics in the Logic & Action Plan.

Nicole Carolozo suggested adding language to the performance target stating the CRWG would invite subject matter experts to better understand impacts. Jason Dubow said this description could be specific to other workgroup requests. It could state “respond to and facilitate increased awareness/knowledge to particular requests on better understanding sea level rise impacts to habitats and their ecosystem services.” He stated this could help CRWG serve more as a connector for those requests instead of increasing capacity for it. Julie stated there is a similar action item related to his suggestion further in the Logic & Action Plan. She said she put the GIT-Funded project as a performance target because it is a project the workgroup is supporting. She stated there was an action item in the last Logic & Action Plan that stated to compile all the work being done by CBP partners, but the CRWG, due to capacity issues, cannot compile it all.

Sean Corson said it may be helpful to make a distinction on which actions the workgroup wants to take full responsibility and actions they are consulting or advising.

Jason Dubow stated to not spend time compiling all of the climate change research and other work happening. Instead, as specific requests come in from other workgroups, do the work only at that time to identify the climate change research and other work that would help with the particular request. Scott Phillips suggested the CRWG put the responsibility on partners to provide a summary of their existing efforts toward needs the workgroup has identified. The CRWG would provide the template, and it is on the partner to respond. Julie Reichert-Nguyen stated that there could be a DEIJ component for this action when targeting the area based on the data available. Tuana Phillips agrees with Julie. DEIJ would be applicable especially with the ecosystem services component. A question to consider is which communities are gaining/losing ecosystem services associated with sea level rise impacts to habitat?

Developing a research agenda and providing estimates of associated costs to inform a potential funding plan on climate change impacts to BMP performance is another primary action. Jason Dubow asked if the workgroup has the resources to complete this action. Mark Bennett said that talking to other GITs about what is the highest priority resource related to BMP performance and climate change is doable. He stated estimating the cost seems open ended so he does not think cost is the priority and should not be part of the action. Nicole Carolozo stated to start with looking into the most prevalent or cost effective BMPs.

The next action is related to the CRWG GIT-Funded project on developing the Bay-wide Climate Resilience Scorecard. Julie Reichert-Nguyen is the primary lead

and multiple workgroup members are on the steering committee. The workgroup members agreed it should be a primary action.

The action to assist stakeholders with “shovel-ready” design plans for adaption projects is supported by the TOGI GIT-Funded project. The CRWG is playing more of support role than a lead role.

The next action is trying to identify ways in which to accomplish the adaptation outcome. It states to expand resource capacity to implement climate adaptation projects. A performance target is to identify and provide assistance on 1 – 2 proposals for adaptation projects. Julie Reichert-Nguyen asked if anyone strongly feels this is an action the workgroup should not do.

Jason Dubow stated it is something they should not do and instead provide support by helping with coordination because there are state groups already doing it. Nicole Carlozo said in Maryland they have partners that assist with these roles so it would make more sense to serve as a connector with those partners or provide a space for those partners to come to present their work. Mark Bennett asked Jason Dubow to work on some language on what role the workgroup should do.

The last primary action discussed during the meeting is to increase understanding of science needs to apply finance strategies related to blue carbon sequestration and resilience crediting. Mark Bennett asked if it should be a little bit broader because there might be other topics besides blue carbon that members are interested in learning about finance strategies. Elizabeth Andrews stated she understands there is a lot of interest, but she wondered with the limited capacity if that is something the workgroup can tackle. Mark Bennett said the role of the workgroup is the connecting role for this action. Mark Bennett said they could put facilitator in front of every action because he sees that as the role of the workgroup.

Kristin Saunders stated the CRWG could make intentional reference to connect with the Budget and Finance workgroup. They just talked about adding a focus on climate in their workplan.

3:50 PM *Wrap Up, Julie Reichert-Nguyen & Mark Bennett*

Julie will review action items identified during the meeting and Mark will discuss next steps.

4:00 PM *Adjourn*

Next Meeting:

- Wednesday, February 17, 2021, 1:30 – 3:30 PM
 - Follow-up on any actions items for workplan

Participants: Breck Sullivan, Julie Reichert-Nguyen, Sherry Whitt, Thomas Butler, Peter Tango, Matthew Konfirst, Ian Yue, Allison Breitenother, Jason Dubow, Mark Bennett, Scott Phillips, Sally Claggett, Taryn Sudol, Ashley Gordon, Jackie Specht, Kate McClure, Katherine Brownson, Kelly Maloney, Marisa Baldine, Melissa Deas, Molly Mitchell, Katie Matta, Neil Ganju, Sean Corson, Katherine Dyer, Kristin Saunders, Tuana Phillips, Ivan Hernandez, Jessica Rodriguez, Zoe Johnson, Gopal Bhatt, Lisa Easton, Nicole Carlozo, Joel Carr, Bruce Vogt, Elizabeth Andrews, Ann Phillips, John Denniston, Zack Greenberg, Jim George, Amanda Poskaitis, Susan Larcher