



Climate Resiliency Workgroup Conference Call

Monday, July 16, 2018

1:30 PM – 3:30PM

Minutes

- 1:30 Welcome, Introductions and Announcements** (Mark Bennett, USGS; Erik Meyers, The Conservation Fund)
CBP Announcements:
- Release of Final STAC Report: [Monitoring and Assessing Impacts of Changes in Weather Patterns and Extreme Events on BMP Siting and Design](#)
 - Approval of STAC Workshop proposal: [Chesapeake Bay Program Climate Change Modeling 2.0](#). This workshop will be happening September 24-25th in Annapolis.
- 1:35 Partner Announcements** (CRWG Members)
- Army Corps of Engineer has come out a comprehensive watershed plans and is looking for project ideas to include.
Nicole announced that MDNR released the [Community Resilience Grant](#).
- 1:40 Climate Change Indicator Project** (Laurel Abowd, CRC, Peter Tango, USGS)
Objective: Provide an update on the status of the twenty-one draft climate change indicator implementation plans and discuss process to prioritize indicators for future development.
Support Materials:
- [Project Fact Sheet](#)
 - [Indicator Implementation Plan Review Table](#)
 - [Cover Memo for Expert Reviewers](#)
- Winding down the indicator project, slated to be finished in July. Peter announced that ERG has completed Implementation Strategies and is circling for comment inside ERG. Six of the eight indicators will be published soon. Many collaborators are looking for dataset. We also have a spreadsheet for further information on future development on the indicators.
- 1:50 Climate Policy Proposal Re: 2021 Offsets** (David Flores, Center for Progressive Reform)
- David reviewed a potential policy proposal that builds upon current plans for climate modeling and deliberation on climate offsets in 2021, and is looking for the CRWG's support in formally recommending this policy proposal to the Management Board and PSC. David Flores published op-ed articles on Bay Journal which talks about the stopping rules of EPA. PSC meeting has directed to look at the climate science of the modeling. Would this group be ready to fully recommend this policy proposal for CBP? There is concern about the language for modeling for climate for PSC adoption. Flores asks for a policy that allows for more transparency for this work. "Stopping Rules" is a policy term that has been used in EPA for many years, specifically clean air act for ambient air quality standards. Based upon the science up until a stopping point, the agency will lock in to that standard at that time, until a specified time in the future. This would allow for strong commitment for climate offsets re: the pollution limits.
- Discussion:
- Jim George asked how can the application of this proposal significantly change the path that we are already on. David responded that this policy proposal would lock in to a commitment on climate offsets from the climate modeling. The climate policy that is currently adopted, "the partnership will consider results of the modeling", giving wiggle room to not follow with those

results. It ensures the jurisdiction to commit the climate offsets. The stopping rules lock the nutrient reduction efforts by the jurisdiction partners and allows the decision makers and the scientists to collaborate on this task. Jim commented that adopting quantitative goal but there must be technical support behind the stopping rule.

- Lew commented that the Bay program has a deadline to examine the science and so that the managers on the ground. He added that the governance structure also ensures delivery of the science.
- David added that Rich Batiuk did not provide feedback on this policy.
- Jim would need to take this up to the chain and added that the process tool is a valuable tool but needs more clarification on this concept. Elizabeth agreed.
- David is asking for the group's support in asking the MB and PSC to develop a stopping rule.
- Mark is asking David to turn this Bay Journal Op Ed into a one-page proposal, and he would take this to Rich and asking for advice. In this case, jurisdiction representatives can also provide feedback.

2:05

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 August. 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 provided from an earlier meeting, listed below. Please be prepared to discuss these ideas further, and/or other project ideas for this year's funding.

March GIT Funding ideas:

- a. ["Climate-Resilient BMP" Indicator Project"- David Flores](#)
- b. [Landowner Attitudes on Shoreline Erosion Control- Jim George/Andrew May](#)

These proposals are due by the end of this Friday to the GIT.

Discussion for David:

- Lew asked if this be more likely to move toward to stormwater management in terms of developing metrics. David responded that stormwater management is just an example. Lew recommended that it would be good to provide jurisdictions with a roadmap to implementation to climate change.
- Jennifer approved this proposal because of two reasons: watershed wide applicability and the metrics of climate adaptivity. We currently don't have great metrics for looking at adaptive capacity. The current Indicators project also doesn't address resilience from across the watershed. This can be beneficial of climate resiliency of community and water quality.
- Mark asked about the cost of the proposal and if proposal funds a workshop of some kind. David responded that based on the comments he received, the best format for this would be a workshop. Mark added that the project lead would be the primary person interacts with project awardee. Susan Julius is interested in working with David in this subject.
- Lew recommended changing the title of the proposal to climate resilient management matric and the report of the workshop will be aim at the implementation of the climate resilient BMP. He added that the workshop should be a two-day meeting. Mark agreed with the idea of extending it into a two-day workshop.
- Lew added to have a preparation meeting with other workgroups such as ag workgroup or storm water workgroup. Susan agreed.
- Peter commented that this can bring in the opportunity to start this effort.

Discussion for Jim:

This proposal can improve the adoption of the living shoreline erosion control.

- Mark asked if the proposal is for MD and VA? Jim responded this is just for MD. Mark added that this proposal would be more competitive if this
- Elizabeth commented that the VIMS researchers have already done similar research. The law regulations are very different laws in MD, VA, and DE. We don't have any information on the costs of living shorelines.

- Kevin commented that he had drafted proposal on attitudes of VA of living shorelines to NFWF but it wasn't accepted. He added that the issue with standard costs is very difficult.
- Rebecca commented that Communication Workgroup and the Habitat WG has put together a proposal on this issue. Kristen recommended that a meeting should be scheduled to discuss the opportunity to merge information and become the collaborative project and the additional funding.
- Elizabeth, Rebecca and Jim would be meet afterwards to align their effort.
- Peter asked Kristen if the Habitat Team only put together one proposal. Rebecca responded that this is the only proposal put together by the Communication Workgroup. Kristen added that GIT chair will score each of the proposals during evaluation.

2:30 [Preparation for Strategy Review System Presentation \(Mark Bennett, Jen Dopkowski\)](#)

The Strategy Review System (SRS) occurs every two years to provide workgroups the opportunity to look at Outcome progress, as well as identify obstacles and opportunities. The CRWG presents this information to the Management Board on August 9, with a follow-up meeting Sept. 13.

Preparation for this meeting includes creating a presentation that includes the progress we have made thus far towards our Outcome, as well as the logic behind our work, the status of our management actions, and which actions have or will play the biggest role in making progress.

Support Materials:

- [Draft SRS Quarterly Meeting Logic Table Climate Resiliency from Feb 2018](#)
- [Climate Resiliency Management Strategy](#)
- [A Guide to the Strategy Review System](#)

A dry run presentation will be made to STAR next Thursday. The two presentations for two outcomes have been combined into one presentation.

The fourth bullet on "what is our progress" needs to be reworded.

Discussion:

Lew suggested leading with bullet 3, with slightly reworded framing because this is a large, specific ask.

Jennifer added that much of the work of the CRWG does rely on the workgroups, so an emphasis is needed for their engagement.

Jim asked about the reasoning behind fourth ask since there was a narrative guidance document completed a while back. Mark responded that we need jurisdictions to support in the documents.

Meeting Participants:

Melissa Merritt
 Cuiyin Wu
 Jen Dopkowski
 Peter Tango
 Mark Bennet
 Ashely Gordon
 Elizabeth Andrews
 Nicole Carlozo
 Matt Konfirst
 David Flores
 Shannon Sprague
 Jennifer Demooy
 Melissa Deas
 Rebecca Chillrud
 Lew Linker
 Jim George
 Kristin Sanders
 Kevin Dubois
 Laura Drescher