Climate Resiliency Workgroup (CRWG)

Thursday, April 17, 2025

1:30 – 3:30 PM

Meeting Materials: Link

Actions

- STAR/CRWG Leadership Team will complete revisions in the adaptation outcome write-up for the Management Board retreat on May 7th and 8th. The retreat is where the Management Board will review the workgroup's recommended outcome language and discuss timelines for updating management strategies for each outcome.

Minutes

1:30 – 1:35 PM *Welcome – Mark Bennett, Chair (USGS) and Julie Reichert-Nguyen, Coordinator (NOAA)*

Meeting Focus:

Share input from the Management Board on the Monitoring and Assessment framework disposition and review Adaptation outcome language and targets (formerly referred to as outputs).

Workgroup Announcements:

- The 2025 National Coast Resiliency Fund is now open! You can read more about the proposals here. NFWF will award grants to create and/or restore natural systems in order to increase protection for communities from coastal hazards, such as storms, sea- and lake-level changes, inundation, and coastal erosion, while improving habitats for fish and wildlife species. NCRF program priorities include: nature-based solutions, community risk reduction benefits, fish and wildlife benefits, community impact and engagement, and transferability and sustainability. Pre-proposals are due through Easygrants by May 6th, 2025, 11:59 pm. For questions or more information email **NCRF@nfwf.org.**
  - Average award for community capacity building and planning, site assessment and preliminary ensign, final design, and permitting: 100,000 to 1,000.
  - Average award for restoration and implementation: 1,000,000 to 10,000,000

1:35 – 1:50 PM *Review Feedback from the Management Board on Outcome Assessments*
Presenter: Ken Hyer (USGS, STAR Chair) and Julie Reichert-Nguyen

Description: Share Management Board consensus decisions on the Monitoring and Assessment framework and the Adaptation outcome.

Materials:
- *Slides presented at the Management Board meeting here*

Discussion Summary:
- Monitoring and assessment is to become a 'framework' to integrate changing environmental conditions (CEC) across all outcomes, with a CEC team created to implement.
- The adaptation outcome has a potential home under a proposed Lands and Watersheds goal, with the workgroup reviewing 'SMART' outcome language.

Discussion:
- Ken Hyer's presentation
  - Creation of monitoring and assessment 'framework'
    - Focus on integration science and changing environmental conditions into all the outcomes via a framework
  - Creation of CEC (changing environmental conditions) team to incorporate concepts into each outcome
    - Start with team of subject matter experts (SME), facilitate processes, fill science gaps, and develop and support implementation plans
    - Not every outcome every year
- Taryn: What is the timeline? It seems like filling gaps could go on for a very long time
  - Ken: Our goal isn't for gap filling to take multiple years, the idea was to have this team work with an outcome, maybe a year maybe 18 months and then move on
  - Julie: We have had multi year efforts, so definitely something for us to think about as well
- Adaptation outcome
  - Potential home under a proposed lands and watersheds goal
  - Weave climate resiliency goal language into other goals- conserved lands and watershed health, habitat and wildlife, engaged communities
- Definitions slide
  - Joe: Clarification; saw we had adaptation under lands and watersheds. Adaptation crosses a lot of different topics like resilience. What is the difference between resilience and adaptation outcomes?

- - - Julie: The adaptation outcome is focused on place based, and will be driven by areas where adaptation needs are. Monitoring is more focused on science while adaptation is focused on implementation.
    - Joe: As long as the work is distributed across communities and outcomes I think that works.
  - Christine Kirchhoff (chat): Resilience is a system state (at least in the literature) so it makes sense in the way it was generally integrated across the various goals. How does this conversation relate to the other conversation about getting climate information into these efforts. ...sounds like you don't have the answer yet.
    - Julie: I agree, we are still trying to sort that out. The CEC team will be a paired effort to support adaptation effort, they are going to compliment one another that depends on how we structure.
  - Kristin Saunders (chat): My observation is that having climate as a stand alone goal has not resulted in the full integration and so having it weaved throughout other goals might work better. However, my experience with the program is that if there is not a champion or a set of champions or a specific workgroup to drive the focus on this topic, it won't happen as easily if at all. So whether a stand alone goal or integrated across several other goals and outcomes, you will still need a group of people who are experts to infuse that thinking across the other groups.
    - Julie: Wonderful point, 100% agree. We need people to champion throughout. There will be more discussion during the May 7th retreat.
  - Keith Bollt (chat): Christine, I think the answer is the team that Ken was describing before. At least that is the intent of the team that is designing it
    - Julie: I am thinking along the same lines, maybe we can provide recommendations as well.
    - Keith: More focused on providing hard science but there may also be opportunity to have people walk them through implementation.
  - Kristin Saunders (chat): Maybe in the governance work, we could reflect the need for climate experts as specific members of each goal team to distribute the expertise and be intentional.
    - Julie: Yes, it's important to move this forward in an effective way.
- Adaptation decision recap
  - Outcome needs to be plain language, SMART added to targets under the language; will discuss today.
  - Keith Bolt (chat): I heard a different definition for "target"- this is a definition for activity not output- which is a reason for the MB to stick with a pre established

strategic plan framework such as the one created by the Kellogg Foundation (resource-activity-output-outcome)

- ○ Breck Sullivan (chat): This is the definition of output language Anna Killus (MB Member) presented at the MB meeting: The more direct products of the actions we plan for and take as partners.
- ○ Breck Sullivan (chat): Kellogg Foundation has also used this definition for output: Outputs are the direct products of program activities and may include types, levels and targets of services to be delivered by the program. If you accomplish your planned activities, then you will hopefully deliver the amount of product and/or service that you intended.
- ○ Keith Bollt (chat): Thanks Breck. Yeah, I think it would have been better for the MB to define "output" rather than switch it to "target" and make up another definition, there was a lot of thought that went into the Kellogg Foundation's strategic planning framework. The confusion around the difference between output and outcome was that the definition hadn't been shared and there wasn't an agreement on if output-focused groups got less resources, not what the definitions are, the Kellogg Foundation already defined them
- ○ Keith Bollt (chat): A missed opportunity. Unfortunately, I think it's going to be more complicated to explain to the public, not less, because we're making up our own strategic planning schematic
- ○ Julie: We will focus on SMART language for targets today. How can we create something specific that is measurable and time bound; we will think about targets in that context.

1:50 – 3:20 PM *Review Adaptation Language and Outputs*
Facilitators: *Julie Reichert-Nguyen and Mark Bennett*

Description: We will review Adaptation Outcome language and targets that CRWG leadership drafted based on input from members during the last meeting. We will also briefly brainstorm possible indicators.

Materials:

- ● *[Draft language and targets](#)*
- ● *Last meetings [notes](#)*

Discussion Summary:

- ● The workgroup was mostly in support of the targets, with a few reservations. The workgroup had reservations about the language 'increase the use of', because the

workgroup does not have authority to require action. Suggested to use 'continually', 'incentivize', or 'promote.'

● Target responses also included emphasis on solutions that work for different types of communities, and building capacity.

● Indicator responses included discussion around not double counting what jurisdictions will be working on anyway, and how to get partners to engage in watershed status updates.

Menti Discussion:

Menti slides can be found [here](#).

● Are you supportive of the outcome language?
   ○ Adrienne: I am supportive, I agree with the premise of greater adaptation of strategies across the watershed; I will say I do have a slight reservation about 'increase the use of' language- as a signatory, we don't have any authority to require a community to do that, we could say 'continually increase the knowledge of' that is the same outcome but without implying you have the ability to guarantee adoption/use of strategies. Could say 'increase knowledge of nature based strategies to consider in design.'
   ○ Keith Bollt (chat): Toxics is using similar phrasing as Local Leadership
   ○ Kristin Saunders, (chat): Incentivize is another area where you might have ability to influence
   ○ Joe Galarraga (chat): "Promote"
   ○ Ben McFarlane (chat): I like "promote" or "encourage," but are those definitive enough?
   ○ Cassie Davis, (chat): We had this in the original "Continually pursue, design and construct restoration and protection projects"
   ○ Nicole Carlozo (chat): Inform the use of?
   ○ Keith Bolt (chat): Agreed Cassie, projects is better than strategies, guilty as charged, but government is better at planning than doing and pushing ourselves to implement is important
   ○ Keith: I am yes with reservation, it is hard to put mandatory action into voluntary partnership. Another reservation is semantics; it is written like an activity (increasing use of strategies), which would be a target/output, the output is whatever the strategies create, which is a more resilient watershed. Thinking about the semantics of how we are writing the sentence, squinting a little more at the definitions and how to word the different aspects.
   ○ Ben: I am yes with reservations, for urban communities nature based strategies don't always work, there needs to be a balance between economic,

environmental factors, etc. Increase use of adaptation strategies that incorporate nature based features, recognize that for some communities a more hybrid approach will be necessary. Don't work for everything
- Cassie Davis: Thinking if the general public will know what we mean by nature based strategies vs. restoration protection projects
    - Julie: Something I went back and forth with, I was debating if we should say nature based, as a group we want them to think about nature based strategies though instead of just jumping to a sea wall.
    - Breck Sullivan (chat): Maybe nature-based can go into the bullets
- Are you supportive of the targets
    - Nicole Carlozo (chat): I think it may be difficult to track the first target - plans and design of all restoration and protection projects?
    - Cassie: Target thoughts- cassie, maybe a different word, like 7 'selected' instead of regional to show there is a method.
        - Julie: If we could track what our agency or organization is working on with partners we could track that within our membership first and participating organizations than tracking everything happening in an area
    - Adrienne: Increase resilience knowledge of those implementing the projects, but don't specify the projects themselves. Increase knowledge base of those implementing the projects.
    - Menti response: Target 3, while important, relies on conducting evaluation of implementation and development of metrics. How would this work if we cannot ensure its implementation?
        - Julie: Something we have been trying to track for a while. We have consulting partners who have been trying to get funding for projects to start using data collected and collect more to build resilience effectiveness metrics. Good point, we can't guarantee implementation, but we did get awarded STAC synthesis funding to compile data across projects implemented, we can be able to compile what is learned and put it into documents that can provide this guidance. Overarching goal to share this knowledge too.
        - Joe: Feels like a high capacity activity, whereas target 2 has the most agreement with things that are actionable.
        - Breck Sullivan (chat): I also see #3 of how the workgroup functions to share information/lessons learned.
        - Keith Bollt (chat): Guidance could be an activity towards increased capacity as an output or outcome

- ○ Menti response: To help with tracking, maybe you could generate a list of strategies or projects that apply. Then you could also apply a weighted scale to those i.e. a big living shoreline compared to a rain garden
  - ■ Taryn: People think 'is this a nature based strategy?' having a straightforward list, how do you tally those together, members could even it out, some take a lot of effort, maybe some thought into weighting and criteria could help be more representative.
  - ■ Julie: We can explore this when we develop the management strategy/activity.
- ● Indicator responses
  - ○ Menti response: I think it is hard to measure what the bay program is adding value too, versus what is happening anyways. We shouldn't take credit for what would have existed anyways or vice versa. Expectations setting
    - ■ Nicole: If we are asking them to provide knowledge on projects already permitted, they could be double counted. Julie- back to tracking those that we are directly involved with
    - ■ Julie: Good comment. It is easy to tell when they come to us and ask for help, but if they move forward with their own initiatives, we don't want to take credit. How do we differentiate where we build capacity vs. what would have happened anyway?
    - ■ Taryn: I agree with differentiation, but also knowing overall pulse, are we tracking upwards ex. Helps us decide where we should add additional capacity.
    - ■ Julie: I could see an indicator where we show overall nature-based strategies being implemented and where we have added capacity (activities happening here, activities we are involved with, a bar graph that visually sets expectations)
  - ○ Breck Sullivan (chat): That is a great point Taryn! A huge value of the CBP for many outcomes is that we are able to show a watershed status/overall account of what is happening.
  - ○ Keith Bolt (chat): Agreed Taryn and Breck. The challenge is getting partners to contribute to that type of indicator if they don't see the value of a watershed status
  - ○ Taryn A Sudol: Yeah good point Keith, it would be ideal if what we're asking for is publicly available
  - ○ Menti response: could perform a pilot or collaborative review first in certain focus areas that could trail the metrics and refine based in feasibility and capacity

- - Julie: I love this idea, thank you, could really help set us up for success
    - ○ Menti response: will these indicators be identified and reported 'as a workgroup' or by individual jurisdictions? I think they are fine by workgroup but may be difficult for jurisdictions to track
      - - Julie: yes, the thought was it would be by the places identified. We could also look at/track against the BMP's being tracked in other jurisdictions

- **3:20-3:30 *Member Announcements* and *Wrap-up***

  Next Meeting: May 15, 2025

Name	Affiliation	Name	Affiliation
Julia Fucci	CRC	Debbie Herr Cornwell	MDP
Julie Reichert-Nguyen	NOAA CBPO	Emma Corbitt	HRPDC
Adrienne Kotula	CBC	Joe Galarraga	TNC
Allison Welch	CRC	Ken Hyer	USGS
Ellen Egen	AquaLaw	Kristin Saunders	UMCES
Gabrielle Rosario	Virginia Seagrant Fellow	Marisa Baldine	Alliance for the Bay
Jessica Shippen-Hansen	Thomas Jefferson Soil and Water Conservation District	Molly Mitchell	VIMS
Keith Bollt	EPA CBPO	Nadya Chehab	MDA
Arianna Johns	VA DEQ	Nicole Carlozo	MDNR
Ben McFarlane	Hampton Roads Planning PDC	Richard Zhang	
Breck Sullivan	USGS CBP	Erin Sonnenburg	CRC
Cassie Davis	NYS DEC	Taylor Woods	USGS EESC
Christine Kirchhoff	STAC PSU	Taryn A Sudol	MD Sea Grant
Meg Cole	CRC STAC	Wai Yan Siu	ODU