

STAR/Beyond 2025 - Climate Small Group Meeting
Theme: Gathering Feedback to Address
Beyond 2025 Steering Committee Charge

Thursday, November 16, 2023

10:00AM – 12:00 PM

Meeting Materials: [Link](#)

This meeting was recorded for internal use only to assure the accuracy of meeting notes.

ACTION ITEMS

- ✓ Climate Small Group leadership will reach out to Kaylyn Gootman to discuss Puget Sound climate strategy, and anything learned at the CERF conference on other programs' climate strategies.

MINUTES

10:00 AM **Welcome, Introductions & Announcements – *Bill Dennison (UMCES), Ken Hyer (USGS) and Kimberly Van Meter (Penn State) - STAR co-chairs and vice chair, Breck Sullivan (USGS) STAR Coordinator, Peter Tango (USGS) CBP Monitoring Coordinator***

Announcements

Upcoming Conferences, Meetings, Workshops and Webinars

- [CERF 2023 Conference: Resilience & Recovery](#) – November 12-16, 2023, Portland, Oregon.
- [Maryland Water Monitoring Council Annual Conference](#) – November 17, 2023, Linthicum, MD.
- Maryland Water Monitoring Council Environmental DNA (eDNA) Workshop: State of the Science and its Application in Maryland and the Chesapeake Bay Watershed – December 8, 2023, USGS MD-DC-DE Water Science Center, Catonsville, MD.
- [National Conference on Ecosystem Restoration](#) – April 14-19, 2024, Albuquerque, New Mexico.
- [Chesapeake Community Research Symposium](#) – June 10-12, 2024, Annapolis, Maryland.

10:05 AM **Beyond 2025 Briefing on Small Groups – Breck Sullivan (USGS)**

The Beyond 2025 Steering Committee decided on October 26th to create five small groups to each tackle a specific topic area (climate, shallow water habitat, people, clean water, and healthy watersheds). The purpose of the small topical groups is to inform recommendations

around their topics that will inform the Beyond 2025 Steering Committee in forming recommendations around cross-cutting topics for the Executive Council to answer their charge. The small groups are meant to help in breaking down silos and reach topic experts outside of the Beyond 2024 Steering Committee, like GIT and Advisory Committee members. The small groups will each address a series of guiding questions focused on a vision (where do we want to be), value (what we do and how we work), and vanguard (what idea would be transformational for the future of the Bay and its watershed, and what would it take to implement that idea?), as well as some questions around cross-cutting considerations. The small group recommendations will be discussed and refined at the end of February 2024, and provisional recommendations will be presented to the Steering Committee in March 2024 for inclusion in the final product for the Executive Council.

Bo Williams (EPA) noted that the current climate small group is mostly federal representatives, but they are trying to expand the membership. The small group is mainly the people who will be working most closely with the group's recommendations.

Discussion:

Doug Bell (EPA) clarified that the February symposium to discuss and refine small group recommendations will be on February 28th and 29th, 2024 at the Susquehanna River Basin Commission. Bo said the climate small group wants to find other times for broader input in addition to the STAR meetings.

Kristin Saunders (UMCES) said regarding the objectives, the small group can attempt to answer these questions from the Steering Committee, but there may be questions from reports such as from the [Rising Water Temperatures workshop report](#), or the [Comprehensive Evaluations of Systems Response \(CESR\) report](#), that may require being advanced to the Steering Committee. It may be that this group can't answer some of the key consideration/questions but can recommend the Steering Committee needs to wrestle with them as a group. Kristin asked if the small groups are limited to 5 recommendations, and if they can advance questions the Steering Committee needs to grapple with as a whole.

Breck said maybe it is more of a recommendation of what to consider and work more towards. Also, with the timeframe of 3 months, from STAR's perspective as science support, STAR doesn't have the time to answer fully what science is needed for climate beyond 2025. However, STAR can say here are the gaps that need to be considered.

Lee McDonnell (EPA) agreed with Breck. The small groups are putting together information and making recommendations, but the questions don't have to be fully answered. The next steps will be a deeper dive. Recommendations are at higher level, but there will be a lot of information that comes with and it's important to capture both detail and higher level information. The next groups should have all the meeting material so they can consume that as part of the next step process.

Breck and Doug reiterated that the answers the small groups provide to the guiding questions are not the recommendations (to the Executive Council) themselves, but help inform them.

10:20 AM Climate Small Group Plans – Bo Williams, Climate Small Group Co-Chair (EPA)

Discussion Questions:

- Any red flags on the scope of work? Any recommendations programmatically?
- What other learnings and recommendations from resource materials already developed align with this small group?

Discussion:

Resources suggested: *Resource (recommended)*

- [Science Needs Database](#) (Breck Sullivan)
- [USDA Fifth National Climate Assessment](#) (Peter Claggett)
- [Phase 6 Model Climate Change Documentation](#) (Jeremy Hanson)
- Climate Projections previewed by Lew Linker at Back to the Future climate discussion (Kristin Saunders)
- [A Systematic Review of Chesapeake Bay Climate Change Impacts and Uncertainty: Watershed Processes, Pollutant Delivery, and BMP Performance](#) (Jeremy Hanson)
- UMCES - Enhancing Chesapeake Bay Partnership Activities by Integrating Social Science (Amy Handen)
- [IPCC Reports](#) (Kaylyn Gootman)
- Studies informing details of protected lands loss from sea level rise (Kristin Saunders/Chesapeake Conservation Partnership)
- Impacts of climate mitigation strategies on the watershed and Bay- i.e., utility-scale solar development (Peter Claggett)
- Half Earth premise from EO Wilson Foundation (Kristin Saunders)
- [Future of America's Forests report](#) (Katie Brownson)
- [Fifth National Climate Assessment](#) (Jeremy Hanson)
- [Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission Climate Change Guidance](#) (Chris Moore)
- [The Nature Conservancy's Resiliency and Connected Landscapes](#) (Katie Brownson)
- [NPS National Climate Change Response Strategy](#) (Wendy O'Sullivan)
- [Climate Vulnerability Index](#) (Kate Allcock)
- [Chesapeake Bay Environmental Justice and Equity Dashboard](#) (Kate Allcock, Sophie Waterman)

Peter Claggett (USGS) commented that an organizing concept to structure the discussion could be around the things that are known or expected (like temperature increase, extreme weather). Further down that spectrum of uncertainty are things that are potentially high uncertainty and high impact like how farmers respond to climate. If farming changes in substantial ways that could make a substantial difference and would make current efforts feel like scratching the surface. Farmers could adapt in ways that make them more or less impactful to the Bay. Should the Bay Program for beyond 2025 look at things that have high uncertainty and high impact? That might be a way to organize considerations.

Ken Hyer (USGS) suggested also looking at the list of papers/publications that were shared with ERG as they started their assessment.

Kaylyn Gootman (EPA) commented wondering if it might be helpful to have a short conversation with another program like Puget Sound. Chesapeake Bay is a unique watershed, but others face similar and different problems. How do other programs like Puget Sound or Gulf of Mexico plan to tackle climate? August Goldfischer (CRC) added that at the CERF conference there were relevant presentations from other programs that could be helpful.

Ken said this was a good idea and wondered if any have developed a specific climate strategy CBP could draw from.

Jeremy Hanson commented that the current meeting's agenda is focused more on Vision, but something about Value is that the Chesapeake Bay region already does modeling and climate research REALLY well. CBP could have an endless list of studies, reports and resources.

Kaylyn shared Puget Sound Partnership Resources – PSP's [2022-2026 Action Agenda](#), and their [Strategy 18 on climate change](#).

10:50 AM Vision Question: Break Out Groups – All

Discussion Questions:

- What does a resilient Bay and watershed look like?
- What does resiliency look like for all types of communities?
- What key climate vulnerabilities do we need to consider in our vision for resilient Bay and watershed and on what timeframe?
- What are the implications of climate change for our overall vision of Chesapeake Bay restoration? How does this influence a climate goal/outcome(s)?
- Are there opportunities to integrate climate mitigation and carbon stewardship into the Chesapeake Bay Program's vision for a climate resilient Bay and watershed?

11:45 AM Vision Question: Report Out – All

[Presentation with Breakout Group responses](#)

12:00 PM Adjourn

Attendees:

Alexander Gunnerson (CRC), Alexandra Fries (UMCES), Amy Handen (EPA), Ashley Hullinger (PA DEP), Ashley Kelly (DOD), August Goldfischer (CRC), Bailey Robertory (CRC), Bo Williams (EPA), Breck Sullivan (USGS), Brittany Hall (NPS), Bruce Vogt (NOAA), Chris Moore (CBF), Doug Austin (EPA), Doug Bell (EPA), Gina Hunt (MD DNR), Greg Barranco (EPA), Jeremy Hanson (CRC), Jillian Seagraves (MD DNR), Joel Blomquist (USGS), John Wolf (USGS), KC Filippino (Hampton Roads PDC), Katie Brownson (USFS), Kaylyn Gootman (EPA), Ken Hyer (USGS), Kim Van Meter (Penn State), Kristin Saunders (UMCES), Lee McDonnell (EPA), Lorenzo Cinalli (USFS), Meg Cole (CRC), Peter Claggett (USGS), Sarah Lane (MD DNR), Sophie Waterman (CRC), Tou Matthews (CRC), Wendy O'Sullivan (NPS), Kate Allcock (EPA)