
Climate Resiliency Logic Factors Discussion

March 15, 2021
CRWG Meeting

Julie Reichert-Nguyen, Climate Resiliency Workgroup Coordinator
NOAA Chesapeake Bay Office

Logic Factors - Monitoring and Assessment

- Scientific Capabilities
 - Complexity to project, model, and monitor ecosystem change
 - Propose adding non-climate stressor language under this factor instead of having a separate factor for it
- Geographic Extent/Variability of the Watershed
 - Tidal versus nontidal - challenges in data consistency and comparability among regions
- Complexity of the Monitoring Program
 - Long-term monitoring needed to detect ecosystem change from climate impacts - budgetary challenges
 - What role does CRWG have in addressing monitoring complexity?
Provide information on science needs related to climate stressors?

Logic Factor Modifications

- Monitoring and Assessment - Scientific Capabilities: Merged the multiple stressors factor with this one.
 - Reasoning: CRWG doesn't have the capacity to tackle other stressors - other workgroups in CBP are doing so.
 - Included language that interactions between climate and non-climate stressors are important

Logic Factor Modifications Cont.

Scientific Capabilities: New suggested language

The scientific capabilities to estimate, project, model and monitor ecosystem changes and impacts as a result of climate change are complex just emerging and resource intensive. Additionally, impacts are exacerbated by non-climate stressors (e.g., land-subsidence, land use change, growth and development). Appropriate science and modeling of climate and non-climate related stressors are necessary for Chesapeake Bay Program partners to properly address climate impacts during policy planning and adaptation efforts.

Logic Factors - Adaptation

- Stakeholder Engagement
 - Lack of understanding/agreement – what it means to be resilient; acceptance
- Capacity
 - Lack of understanding of science to incorporate meaningful change in plans, programs, processes
 - Challenges: time consuming, costly, and resource constraints; add variability in adaptation approaches?
- Authority
 - Response to climate change limited by legislative, policy, and regulatory authorities
- Guidance
 - Lack of information (models, tools, and metrics) to develop adaptation strategies or to measure efficacy of response
 - Add guidance needed on variability of approaches? add lack of data synthesis?
- Collaboration
 - Leverage resources: change consistent to strategic adaptation approaches?

Logic Factor Modifications

- Adaptation - Collaboration: Modified text to focus on maximizing limited resources and providing strategic adaptation approaches
 - Reasoning: Consistent “one size fits all” approaches are unlikely. While ideal for tracking, consensus likely unattainable.
 - It would seem the CRWG is more suited to facilitate collaboration that leverages resources, in addition to reaching agreement on best practices related to the approaches.

Logic Factor Modifications Cont.

Collaboration: New suggested language

The many and diverse stakeholders and organizations that make up the Bay Program are a strength, but it also causes collaboration challenges that must be addressed in order to maximize limited resources and provide strategic adaptation approaches across the watershed.

Need to achieve strategic collaboration that maximizes limited resources; need consensus on strategic adaptation approaches that fit the impact and area of concern

Logic Factor Modifications

- Adaptation - Capacity: Incorporated variable approaches in this factor instead of it being its own factor
 - Reasoning: Capacity could become an issue depending on how many approaches need review/guidance
- Adaptation - Guidance: Incorporated text from variable approaches in this factor
 - Reasoning: Variability in institutional responses affect the development of guidance.