



Climate Resiliency Workgroup

September 19th, 2022

1:30-3:30 PM EST

Event webpage:

https://www.chesapeakebay.net/what/event/climate_resiliency_workgroup_meeting_september_2022

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

Minutes

Action Items:

- Strategy Review System:
 - Update progress made towards local engagement to green based on feedback received during October meeting
 - Include the Inflation Reduction Act in the Quarterly Progress Meeting Presentation under the “on the horizon” section
 - Send survey to workgroup members ahead of November Meeting
 - Incorporate information on how workgroup handles Chesapeake Bay Program requests into Quarterly Progress Meeting to convey to Management Board how the workgroup supports other groups within the Bay Program
 - Include tentative timeframes for when request for the Management Board’s help is need in the Quarterly Progress Meeting Presentation
- Future Meeting Themes and Items:
 - Plan discussion during future CRWG meeting on what is meant by “tracking resilience” as it relates to the climate resiliency outcomes in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement
 - Invite EPA ORD to present on their projects aimed at quantifying resilience effectiveness
 - Explore potential themed meeting focused on calculating carbon sequestration and the role of the workgroup in supporting this type of work in relation to the climate resiliency outcomes in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement
 - Invite representative from Local Government Advisory Committee to present on recommendations from the Local Government Forum: Integrating Resilience into Local Planning
 - Explore holding a meeting to focus on identifying gaps in the resiliency work that is currently underway (e.g., coastal forests)

- Explore future meeting theme where jurisdictions share their strategies on how they help increase capacity for localities who are applying for grants
- Workgroup Charter: Revisit development of workgroup charter to set process on how the workgroup supports other Chesapeake Bay Program workgroups and Goal Implementation Teams
- November Meeting: Send scheduling poll to workgroup members and Chesapeake Bay Program partners
- Targeted Outreach for Green Infrastructure Project: Julie reached out to project leads and Habitat GIT coordinator about the final report. Jamileh will send the final report to workgroup members and interested parties once the report is made available.
- Executive Council Climate Change Directive Workplan: Follow up with the workplan coordinating team to check status of workplan. Send the final workplan to workgroup members and interested parties once it is made available.
- Strategic Engagement Team: Follow up with the new Strategic Engagement team to ensure that they are represented at the November CRWG meeting which is focused on workplan development. Potential collaboration around developing a dashboard or self-reporting tool for jurisdictions to share their climate resilience efforts.

1:30 PM Welcome, Opening Remarks, and Announcements – Mark Bennett, Chair (USGS) & Julie Reichert-Nguyen, Coordinator (NOAA) [10 minutes]

Focus of meeting:

- *This meeting will focus on the Climate Resiliency Workgroup (CRWG) two-year Strategy Review System (SRS) process. We will be reviewing progress made on the current [workplan](#) action items that pertain to our **Adaptation Outcome**, reviewing portions of the Quarterly Progress Meeting Presentation, which will be presented to the Management Board **November 10th, 2022**, and discussing how best to situate the workgroup to capitalize on the influx federal funding.*

Announcements:

- New Co-Chair Announcement: Jackie Specht from The Nature Conservancy has accepted the co-chair position for the Climate Resiliency Workgroup to assist with our Adaptation Outcome activities. Jackie was highly recommended by various partners during our 1 year search to fill the co-chair position. She will be officially starting the role in October.
- CRWG survey to assist with developing next 2-year workplan during November CRWG meeting
- Poll for scheduling November workplan meeting

Summary

Julie began the meeting with a brief overview of the objectives for the meeting, which were to review the progress made towards the Adaptation Outcome, discuss the presentation that will be given to the Management Board at the Quarterly Progress Meeting, and discuss the role

that the workgroup can play in taking advantage of the influx of resilience funding through the different laws (e.g. the Infrastructure Law and the Inflation Reduction Act). She then mentioned that the November CRWG meeting will focus on developing the next two-year workplan, and that this discussion about the influx of funding will help pinpoint where the workgroup can focus their actions to help capitalize on the funding.

Julie then announced that the CRWG is happy to welcome Jackie Specht as the new Co-Chair. Jackie will assist with the Adaptation Outcome and will officially be stepping into the role in October. She will assist with helping connect the workgroup's work with community resilience and helping make progress on our Adaptation Outcome.

Julie mentioned that ahead of the November meeting, the CRWG leadership will be sending a survey out to better understand the themes that workgroup members are focusing on in their own organizations, which will better inform the actions that will be developed for the workplan. This survey will likely be sent out before the November meeting. This survey helps the workgroup better understand where resources can be aligned to help move climate resilience initiatives forward. Additionally, a poll will be sent out to gauge availability for dates in November for the CRWG meeting as the current date falls on Thanksgiving week; this is in an effort to ensure that there is good attendance as the meeting is important for workgroup planning.

Mark Bennett highlighted that Jason Dubow had a comment to add to the announcements. Jason asked if we will be discussing the 2022 Local Government Forum: Integrating Resilience into Local Planning (occurring 9/29/2022). Julie responded by saying that these meetings are invitation only, however she mentioned that she could forward the contact information of anyone interested over to the Forum's organizers. Additionally, she mentioned that she is working with the organizers to come present at one of the CRWG meetings about the proceedings of the Forum. Julie recommended emailing Jamileh Soueidan if interested, and she will notify Julie if there is interest. Julie mentioned that the topic of the Forum is important and one that can be discussed as the next workplan is developed, and how the workgroup can collaborate with local governments and increase local engagement. Julie mentioned that in the review presentation, she discusses how there have been attempts to work with local governments but not much progress has been made, so it is a great time to think about how the workgroup can better engage with local governments. Kevin Du Bois added that for federal agencies, with the current focus on developing climate adaptation plans, it would be helpful if the workgroup could support work that establishes a standardized and accepted method for calculation of carbon capture from non-agricultural best management practices (BMPs) and natural and nature-based projects pursued in the 2014 Watershed Agreement. Julie asked if that is in reference to wetlands, when he mentioned non-agricultural BMPs. Kevin responded that he was referencing wetlands, tree planting and submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV) restoration. He added that for the Navy's climate action 2030 plan, they cite a metric for carbon sequestration and he thinks that other agencies should start focusing on developing a way to calculate the progress made towards meeting their goals. Kevin discussed how there are calculations and methodologies for agricultural BMPs but they do not translate well to non-

agricultural practices and there is going to be a need to develop this methodology in an effort to understand how the actions organizations are taking help meet the goals and objectives of the Watershed Agreement. He further discussed how climate sequestration would be a great topic to focus on as a workgroup. Julie responded that she was on a call with the EPA Office of Research and Development (ORD) who are working in this space, and that she was interested in having them come and present to the workgroup. She invited Roxolana Kashuba, who is with the EPA ORD, to briefly discuss more about their work. She discussed how they are currently working on a project with Jackie Specht, which is co-developing research with a coastal community that is experiencing climate resilience challenges. This research aims to help them think through natural infrastructure opportunities that have coastal resilience benefits as well as a suite of co-benefits related to carbon sequestration. They are looking at blue carbon resources as well as habitat and water quality benefits. The overall goal of the research is to work with community to better understand their needs and help review different resilience and adaptation practices, including both short- and long-term benefits. Julie mentioned how there are opportunities that are being explored to collaborate on work that can lead to metrics on how to quantify carbon sequestration and resilience effectiveness of natural infrastructure or nature based strategies. Julie stated that she is hoping the workgroup will have a themed meeting around this topic early next year and invited Kevin to help plan it if he is interested. Jason added a link in the chat to [Maryland's Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Act Plans](#), which includes calculations related to carbon sequestration. Julie mentioned the workgroup can discuss developing actions around this topic during the November workgroup meeting.

**1:40 PM [Review of Progress on Priority Workplan Actions for the Adaptation Outcome](#)
(Julie Reichert-Nguyen, NOAA) [20 minutes]**

- CRWG and STAR Staff reviewed the current workplan and discussed progress made on each action item from the previous two years. This presentation will review all actions associated with the CRWG Adaptation Outcome.

Summary

Julie started this presentation by discussing how part of the Chesapeake Bay Program's SRS process includes reviewing the previous workplan actions to assess progress. The SRS process is a marathon, not a sprint, and there are several steps that the workgroup takes during the process. Currently, the workgroup is conducting their pre Quarterly Progress Meetings (QPM); the August 2022 meeting focused on the Monitoring and Assessment Outcome, and this meeting focuses on the Adaptation Outcome. The drafted materials (i.e., the Narrative Analysis, QPM Presentation, and color-coded Logic and Action Plan) are all due on October 13th, for the dry run with STAR on October 20th. The QPM will be taking place November 10th. She mentioned that the Adaptation Outcome states to "continually pursue, design, and construct restoration and protection projects to enhance the resiliency of Bay and aquatic ecosystems from the impacts of coastal erosion, coastal flooding, more intense and more frequent storms and sea level rise." She highlighted the fact that the outcome has a strong coastal theme to it. She stated how the workgroup can help with targeting coastal resilience work through helping target projects by looking at the science, as well as provide some design guidance, and assistance in matching funding for groups that are perusing these implementation projects.

Julie then reviewed the Adaptation factors, which are identified barriers or limitations making progress towards the outcome. These factors include: (4) Stakeholder Engagement: There is a lack of understanding or agreement from stakeholders on what it means to be resilient or what constitutes resiliency, including what kind of actions support an adaptive management approach. Lack of appropriate stakeholder engagement jeopardizes acceptance of choices made about action plans and implementation strategies, introducing additional levels of social discord in an already complex environmental-economic-social landscape. There are also different types of stakeholders, and in many cases, they have different goals making it challenging to have adequate resources to facilitate meaningful connections across all stakeholder groups; (5) Capacity: There is a general lack of capacity to fill research gaps and translate the science and incorporate meaningful change into plans, programs, processes or projects across the entire CBP partnership. Although building that capacity is paramount, it can be time consuming and costly, considering the resource constraints faced by governments and organizations and the variability in adaptation approaches; (6) Authority: Governments' and institutions' ability to respond to climate change is also limited by legislative, policy, regulatory and other authorities; (7) Guidance: There is a need to translate existing science into guidance for the CBP, as well as stakeholders, to use to develop adaptation plans and to measure efficacy of response to climate change impacts. The nature of on-the-ground implementation often requires a level of certainty or methods to address uncertainty related to climate change effects on key factors. Additionally, there is variability in institutional responses on how to address climate change impacts making it challenging to develop guidance that can be applied consistently across all watershed jurisdictions; and (8) Collaboration: 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 resources and provide strategic adaptation approaches across the watershed.

Before presenting on the progress made on each action, Julie briefly reviewed how each of the actions are coded. Green means that an action is on track or complete, yellow means that there are slight delays, red means major delays or obstacles, and purple (which is unique to the workgroup) indicate placeholder actions that were included for actions that might be developed; no Adaptation actions were coded purple. Actions with a diamond next to them indicate priority actions as determined by the workgroup or CBP, and actions with a triangle indicate secondary workgroup actions, which were to be addressed if resources and capacity allowed.

Action 2.1 (primary action) aimed to “develop an approach to track climate resilience progress.” Initially, the workgroup tried to make progress on this action through a GIT-funded scorecard project. However, jurisdictional members expressed that a scorecard is not what they needed, which highlighted the fact that the workgroup needs to determine what is meant by “tracking resilience” related to the outcome; Julie mentioned that this can be a discussion during the November meeting, focusing on workplan development. This project was cancelled given that feedback and limited resources. Key takeaways from this action included that projects need a

narrower focus on specific adaptation activities and stakeholder input early on in the process to make progress. As such, this action was color coded red.

Action 2.2 (primary action) aimed to “assist with capacity-building activities that support the implementation of priority climate adaptation actions.” This action has three sub-actions. *Sub-action a* focuses on wetlands, as the outcome attainability team identified that it was one of the outcomes that was behind on meeting the 2025 goal, so it was given priority. This sub action was color coded green, as the workgroup is assisting/leading the ongoing GIT-funded Marsh Adaptation project to make progress on identifying common resilience and social vulnerability metrics for targeting marsh restoration projects as well as identifying jurisdictional partners. Additionally, the workgroup supported the Habitat GIT with their GIT-funded Marsh Migration Data Synthesis project. *Sub-action b* was color coded yellow, as funding opportunities are shared through email announcements, however there still needs to be work done to create an effective strategy in connecting technical grant assistance with groups pursuing climate adaptation projects. *Sub-action c* was color coded as the workgroup supported various GIT-funded projects and STAC workshops that could support adaptation guidance; there is still a need to sort out how best to consolidate the information and funding avenues. *Sub-action d* was color coded green, as CRWG members pursued partnerships through participating in various workshops (e.g., EPA ORD’s Resilient Coastal Wetlands workshop) and hosting joint meetings with the Wetlands Workgroup and Urban Stormwater Workgroup related to living shorelines and stormwater management adaptation.

Action 2.4 (primary action) states that the workgroup will “coordinate with the CBP Communications and Local Engagement Team to help with climate resiliency outcome actions related to communications/outreach and/or local engagement. Both *sub-actions a* and *b* were color coded yellow, as the workgroup participated in the Local Engagement Team’s questionnaire on identifying climate resiliency local engagement needs. However, the communications and local engagement team is currently undergoing restructuring so there is a need to sort out how to collaborate with the team on connecting adaptation projects with community and local government efforts once this restructuring is complete.

Action 2.8 (primary action) focuses on CRWG membership and meetings. *Sub-action a* was color coded green as the workgroup leadership distributed a survey to the workgroup members and interested parties, which led to updating the workgroup membership and connecting expertise with CRWG and cross-workgroup activities. There will be a similar survey sent out this SRS cycle. *Sub-action b* was color coded yellow, as the workgroup is working on expanding its membership to include federal agencies that provide resilience funding, however with the influx of infrastructure funding, this effort was put on hold until there was a better understanding of the funding from these passed laws; this action will need to be revisited. *Sub-action c* was color coded green as the workgroup hosted 15 meetings, including special, themed meetings to support the STAC Rising Water Temperature workshop, information exchange on stormwater resilience, living shoreline and marsh research, and marsh resilience targeting tools.

Action 2.9 (primary action) aimed to “prepare for new federal and state climate initiatives and emerging issues related to the Chesapeake Bay climate resilience needs.” *Sub-action a* was color coded green, as the CRWG leadership provided input on the Executive Council Climate Change Directive and draft workplan; Bo Williams also presented the draft workplan at the June 2022 CRWG meeting. Both *sub-actions b* and *c* were color coded yellow, as the workgroup is still trying to figure out how to better collaborate with federal office directors so that workplan efforts can be better aligned with any developing or new administrative climate policies or directions. The Federal Office of Directors (FOD) was briefed on the EC Climate Change Directive but here were no broader discussions held regarding climate policy. Additionally, FOD and state partners are at capacity determining how to distribute the influx of funding.

Actions 2.5 and 2.6 were both secondary actions, thus they were not color coded. However, there have been efforts that have made progress towards these actions and their sub-actions. Action 2.5 aimed to “provide climate resilience content for educational modules and local government workshops.” Julie mentioned how there was limited capacity to make progress towards this action. This capacity limitation prevented engagement with the educational network. However, CRWG staff did review and provide recommendations on the educational modules developed by the Local Leadership team as well as participate on the steering committee for the GIT-funded project “Planning for Clean Water: Local Government Workshops.” Action 2.6 aimed to “consult on cross-GIT climate change projects.” Julie mentioned that we approach this action by recruiting folks from within the workgroup to sit on steering committees or attend workshops to provide resilience guidance. Progress towards this action included supporting the Habitat GIT’s Targeted Local Outreach for Green Infrastructure (TOGI) in Vulnerable Areas project; supporting the Fisheries GIT’s Forage Indicator Development project, which Julie has provided climate-related considerations; supporting the Stewardship GIT’s Chesapeake Bay Program Social Science Assessment and Integration Road Map Development through participating in the interview process; supporting the Urban Stormwater Workgroup’s Intensity, Duration, Frequency Curves project; holding initial conversations with the Forestry Workgroup about how to build climate resilience considerations into a GIT-funding proposal; and responding to additional requests such as the EPA-ORD engagement on addressing climate resilience science needs.

Julie ended the presentation by reviewing some themes that she noticed while reviewing the progress made towards the Adaptation Outcome. She discussed how focused, themed meetings provided better incremental progress on adaptation outcome activities. She discussed how coastal wetlands has become a focus as a priority adaptation action because the outcome status is off-course and was elevated as a CBP priority, wetlands vulnerability to climate change, their capacity to build resilience, and the recent funding opportunities for natural infrastructure and coastal resilience. She mentioned that collaboration across GITs and amongst workgroups is important to achieve the climate adaptation outcome. However, there is still a need to sort out the role of the workgroup when it comes to local engagement and incorporating community resilience. Lastly, clarification is needed to understand where the CRWG can best support the actions in the Climate Change Directive.

Discussion

Nicole Carlozo asked if it would be possible to see copies of the TOGI designs. Julie responded that she is trying to get a hold of the designs; the project is complete, but the report has not been posted yet. Julie said that she would follow up with the Habitat GIT leads to see if the report is finalized, as she knows that there are people here who would be interested in seeing the report.

Another question posed in the chat asked what role the workgroup had in developing the EC Climate Change Directive or workplan. Julie responded, saying that the workgroup was not asked to develop any of the Directive language, however workgroup leadership reviewed the workplan. The workgroup is a science support team that sits under STAR, while the Directive and workplan are Partnership-wide, and includes activities outside the scope of the CRWG. The effort was led from the Management Board level and was shared to gather input from the federal agencies. Julie was asked to provide input on the workplan and she also reviewed the CRWG Logic and Action plan to see how the workgroup's actions might align with the EC Climate Change Directive workplan. The final workplan has yet to be released but Julie mentioned that she can follow up to check its status. Kevin Du Bois asked if the interim EPA evaluation of water quality milestones provide an opportunity to consider Climate Directive reporting metrics. Kevin expanded upon this question by saying that the DoD is required to identify programmatic milestones that have a climate focus to examine the effect of climate change on water quality BMPs. He was curious if similar metrics will be built into the EC Climate Change Directive workplan. Julie responded that the workplan has two parts: what the workgroups and the Chesapeake Bay Program are involved in and then what the jurisdictions and federal agencies are involved in which can contribute to the workplan. She mentioned in the next presentation, reviewing the Quarterly Progress Meeting Presentation for the Adaptation Outcome, one of the Management Board "asks" is that there is direction provided on the process and who to report to for the Climate Change Directive Workplan. Currently, there is no formal announcement on who will be taking lead for coordinating the workplan efforts. She mentioned that the way the workplan is written is broad, but has specific themes. Additionally, she mentioned that they are using the Virginia Tech BMP report to inform an EPA request for applications that will be addressing climate-related science needs for BMPs. Jason Dubow followed up to Kevin's comment by mentioning that one of the hardest things to accomplish when it relates to a workplan is understanding the work that is currently being done. He mentioned that if there could be a way to track or have organizations report on what work they are doing and how it might support the workplan; he was not sure of the best way to accomplish this (e.g., through a dashboard or table). This can serve as a way to share ideas and identify gaps in the work. Julie mentioned that this is something that will be discussed during the next presentation, but stated that it is something that the workgroup is currently trying to process as it relates to understanding what adaptation work is already occurring and where the workgroup can support that work.

Marisa Baldine commented that since communications had been mentioned a few times throughout the presentation, she wanted to mention that the new Strategic Engagement Team

will be following a similar model to STAR. It will be more people focused than a science focus. It will aim to bring together local engagement and communications. She mentioned that the team will be setting up meetings with different groups, but she and Rachel Felver will be looking through this presentation and the needs that the CRWG might have to identify how they can support the workgroup. Julie replied that it would be helpful to talk about those needs and she invited Marisa or one of the team members to attend the November meeting when the next workplan will be developed.

Laura Cattell Knoll, coordinator for the Local Leadership Workgroup, commented that she thinks the workgroup assisted more with local leadership work than what was presented in the progress presentation. She mentioned that she will be sending an email with the details of what the workgroup assisted with over the past two years. Julie responded in thanks and said that she will update the local engagement progress made.

Cindy Osorto shared [The Climate Mapping for Resilience and Adaptation Assessment tool](#). This tool aims to help different stakeholders at the local, state, and federal level. It is a mapping tool that includes different metrics such as flooding, droughts, and other considerations. She also was wondering if there have been any conversations pertaining to hiring grant writers to help support project proposals aiming to receive funds through the influx of federal funding. She wondered if there could be a more targeted effort to build capacity through hiring grant writers. Julie responded that there is definitely a need to have support for the grant process and that this is a conversation that the workgroup will be having later during this meeting during the facilitated discussion.

2:00 PM **Facilitated Discussion: Drafting the Quarterly Progress Meeting Presentation**
[45 minutes]

- The Quarterly Progress Meeting Presentation for the Chesapeake Bay Program's Management Board reviews the progress made towards our outcomes, shares lessons learned and how we plan to adapt, and highlights how the Management Board may assist the workgroup in achieving the outcomes. This discussion will review the initial draft of the presentation for the adaptation outcome for workgroup input, focusing on how we present the progress we have made, the lessons we have learned, and where we need help.

Summary and Discussion

This presentation is a draft of the one that will be given to the Management Board at the Quarterly Progress Meeting in November. The presentation covers the progress made towards the Adaptation Outcome, the successes and challenges, and the lessons learned and next steps as well as the workgroup's "ask" of the Management Board. Julie began this presentation by stating that this is currently being drafted and the goal of presenting it to the workgroup right now is to discuss their impressions of each slide and incorporate their input. With that said, she

mentioned that she will be incorporating edits and notes in real time as she goes through the slides.

She first reviewed the language of the Adaptation Outcome, which is to “continually pursue, design, and construct restoration and protection projects to enhance the resiliency of the Bay and aquatic ecosystems from the impacts of coastal erosion, coastal flooding, more intense and more frequent storms, and sea level rise.

The Management Board asks the workgroups to use their categories/ranking system to assess what recent progress the workgroup has made toward the outcome and what the overall outlook is. For this outcome, Julie discussed how the Adaptation Outcome is qualitative, which is different from the quantitative outcomes in the Watershed Agreement. Julie discussed how recent progress was marked as increasing as the workgroup has successfully received funding for the GIT-Funded Marsh Adaptation project and many members and workgroup leadership have participated in various resiliency and adaptation workshops. Julie mentioned that there has been progress made in identifying partners and targeting projects, and there is work to be done on determining how to fund and implement them. The current outlook for the outcome was marked uncertain, as in the near-term, there needs to be a means to track implementation of individual climate adaptation-related projects; the workgroup currently does not have the capacity to achieve this. And in the long-term, there is a need for metrics and methods to assess resilience enhancement overall, which would call for a long-term monitoring at climate adaptation locations or analytical modeling support. Julie mentioned that in the near-term there might be a way to create a method for partners to self-report projects, to understand what is occurring in the adaptation space. For the long-term, Julie mentioned that we currently do not have methods or metrics to assess the resilience enhancement. Julie thought it would be a great topic to cover during one of the themed meetings. Jason Dubow mentioned that his organization has been working on this type of question pertaining to facilitating wetland migration. He mentioned that when it comes to metrics there is a realization that there is probably no feasible way to ensure protection of 100% of the migration corridors. He mentions how they are thinking about wetland migration and resilience as minimizing the damage from climate change. Julie changed the slide to reflect that in the long-term, there should be work done in understanding how to assess how damage has been minimized from adaptation efforts. Julie agreed that a lot of the work that is being done is to minimize the loss or impact from climate change. Allison Ng was wondering why the recent outlook was marked as increased. She was wondering how this was determined or measured, as the overall outlook is uncertain. Julie responded that the SRS team described it to the workgroup is that due to the qualitative nature of the outcome, the recent progress is based on the 2-year workplan; it was marked as increasing as there are adaptation projects underway. She mentioned that outlook is more of the big picture of that progress. Mark Bennett also mentioned that a lot of the individual outcomes will be tracked within their respective groups; an example he used was how the wetlands outcome will be tracked by the Wetlands Workgroup. He mentioned how the CRWG’s outcome encapsulates these other outcomes, while the other workgroups are charged with tracking the physical attributes. Julie agreed and added that collaboration with the groups in charge of these other outcomes is key. Nicole Carlozo mentioned that in regard to the Wetlands Workgroup Outcome, wetland loss should be reported every year through the state Coastal

Zone Management programs based on the mapping data; the loss is not specified as to whether it is from development or sea level rise. Julie mentioned that the Wetland Workgroup is looking into how to incorporate more information about the cause of wetlands loss. Kevin Du Bois asked if comparisons of the updated land cover/land use data help track changes in acreage of wetlands and forests. Julie responded by saying that the Land Use Workgroup is working on a GIT-funded proposal for this kind of work.

Julie then reviewed what the workgroup has learned over the past two years; this portion highlighted some of the collaborative efforts and progress made. In this section, Julie discussed how the workgroup supported the TOGI project alongside the Habitat GIT. Additionally, the workgroup supported efforts for coastal wetland restoration as an adaptation strategy through the GIT-Funded Marsh Migration Data Synthesis and the Marsh Adaptation projects. Jason Dubow asked if this portion of the presentation could highlight any kind of work done by any of the signatories of the Watershed Agreement, and not just within the GITs. Julie responded that this presentation focuses on the workgroup's specific actions as it is hard to track all of the progress that the various partners are making. She asked Allison Ng for clarification on whether this presentation should just review workgroup supported actions and activities, and Allison confirmed. Julie then followed up by saying that there is a need to understand the adaptation activities that the partners are undertaking for tracking purposes; there might be a mechanism through the EC Climate Change Directive workplan to do so. She mentioned that the workgroup's management strategy has a section for jurisdictional efforts, so projects and efforts can be highlighted there as well.

Julie then highlighted the GIT-Funded Partnership-Building for Collaborative Marsh Adaptation project as there are a lot of staff and workgroup resources supporting this work. Over the next two years, this project will work on developing and identifying a framework and metrics to support the identification of marsh adaptation projects. There will be a stakeholder survey to increase understanding of partner marsh priorities and a workshop to identify projects.

Julie then discussed the challenges that the workgroup has faced. She first highlighted challenges in tracking adaptation. Past efforts to track resilience were too broad in scope, making it hard to develop an end product (e.g., the scorecard project). There is a need to sort out how best to use the CRWG team to effectively track resilience enhancement. She envisions a future meeting where the workgroup discusses how to overcome this. She mentioned that narrowing the scope to focus on specific adaptation strategies increased the success in making progress on the adaptation outcome. She mentioned that there has been success in focusing on nature-based and natural infrastructure type efforts (e.g., tidal wetlands and forest buffers). This work fits well with both the coastal theme in the outcome and within the collaborative efforts that this CRWG has with other workgroups and their outcomes. An example of this collaboration includes the initial conversations that the CRWG is having with the Forestry Workgroup. Jason Dubow wondered if this workgroup, as it sits under STAR, might be able to ascertain what efforts would be necessary to maintain a certain level of resource protection in terms of habitat. He does not know if it is truly an answerable question, but he wonders if some of the researchers in the workgroup can provide thresholds. Julie would like to think that there

would be a way to develop these thresholds; she added that this work aligns with what the EPA ORD is working on and that it would be great for them to present to the workgroup. Breck Sullivan asked if these thresholds would be housed under the Monitoring and Assessment Outcome rather than the Adaptation Outcome. Julie responded that this work would probably align more with the Monitoring and Assessment Outcome but would help inform adaptation efforts.

Julie then reviewed the “on the horizon” portion, which discusses what might impact some of the actions in the next workplan. She emphasized the influx of the resilience funding and the various laws that have been passed. She added that there is a need to determine the role of the CRWG to help position the workgroup and partners in a way to capitalize on the funding. Additionally, she mentioned the establishment of the Executive Council Climate Change Directive and how the workgroup can support the actions identified within the directive’s workplan. Allison Ng mentioned that it would be beneficial to specifically mention the Inflation Reduction Act.

The next section in the presentation is the “Adapt” section which covers what the workgroup is planning for the next two years based on what was learned over the past two years. She listed some general goals that can be shaped as the next workplan is developed. These include supporting the Habitat GIT in coordinating marsh resilience efforts; identifying groups planning and implementing marsh restoration projects; identifying common resilience and social vulnerability metrics for targeting marsh restoration projects; synthesizing the findings from various wetlands projects and resilience workshops; and providing advisory support for partners applying for near-term resilience funding. Jason Dubow added that it might be good to add a point discussing future meetings that will focus on identifying gaps in what work is currently underway; he mentioned that these meetings can be focused on a specific topic (e.g., coastal forests) as to not be too broad. Breck Sullivan asked how the CRWG is going to present to the Management Board how the workgroup might support or advise all of the climate-related projects that other workgroups and GITs are undertaking. Julie mentioned how there is still a need to develop a workgroup charter explaining how the workgroup interacts with other CBP workgroups and GITs. The Charter development was put on hold until there was an understanding of what the EC Climate Change Directive would look like. Currently, the workgroup has been operating on a requests basis, where Julie will reach out to workgroup members who might be able to assist or support the GITs and other workgroups on their projects. However, due to capacity issues there have been instances where the workgroup could not support some requests. Breck mentioned that it would be beneficial to present this information to the Management Board, as fielding these requests is a large portion of the workgroup’s efforts.

There is a slide for actions the workgroup took to support equitable and inclusive restoration efforts. Some points highlighted by Julie include the TOGI project working with underserved and underrepresented communities and the GIT-Funded Marsh Adaptation project, which aims to work with the Diversity Workgroup to identify and work with leaders of underrepresented groups to participate in the stakeholder engagement portion of the project.

Julie then highlighted the “filling the gap” slide which includes points that will be emphasized to the Management Board. The identified gaps included continuing staffer support, providing a list and point of contacts for coastal/tidal wetland projects being implemented by various organizations and jurisdictions, encouraging the partner organizations to participate in the stakeholder outreach survey through the GIT-Funded Marsh Adaptation project, and defining who will be charged with coordinating the EC Climate Directive workplan effort. Breck Sullivan commented that for the two middle points, it would be helpful if there was a date by which the Management Board should provide the contacts and a date when the survey will be sent.

2:45 PM Facilitated Discussion: Capitalizing on Federal Funding Opportunities [40 minutes]

- This discussion will focus on better defining the role of the Climate Resiliency Workgroup, so that we may better position ourselves to capitalize on the influx of federal infrastructure funding in support of the Adaptation Outcome.

Summary

This portion of the meeting focused on holding a facilitated discussion around the question “what roles can the workgroup support to better position ourselves to capitalize on the influx of infrastructure spending?” Since the previous portions of the meeting resulted in a larger discussion, there was only 20 minutes total remaining for this discussion, thus it was decided that this would be an initial conversation with a more in-depth discussion occurring at the November workgroup meeting. The meeting participants were divided into two breakout groups with Julie and Jamileh facilitating discussions in each room.

Julie provided a brief overview of what group one discussed in the breakout room (see slide one below). She reiterated that this is just an initial conversation, however there were still some great ideas that were generated, which will help inform a larger future conversations. She mentioned that there were a lot of ideas around conceptualizing how to match project ideas and proposals with design experts or funders. Taryn Sudol shared that there is a group that is saltmarsh focused, but they have a list of experts who can be matched with project ideas as they are developed. CRWG might be able to serve as a hub to connect experts with people who need that technical assistance. Jason Dubow also had an idea to create a network of requests going to the overall partnership to assist with matching expertise. Additionally, there is the need to understand how the workgroup can collaborate with some of the other groups.

Jamileh provided the overview for group two (see slide two). Discussions revolved around creating a local repository of grant opportunities that people can access. Nicole Carlozo mentioned that Maryland has a google spreadsheet with a list of funding opportunities that people can access, so they do not need to search around for relevant opportunities. Nicole also had a great idea about developing a communication document on which projects would be good fits for specific funding programs and guidance to local partners on how to find and apply

for these opportunities. Additionally, there was also a discussion about what space the workgroup should operate in (e.g., regional, local, etc.). Ben McFarlane mentioned that focusing on local capacity is critical as they might not have the support needed to apply for these larger grants. Additionally, it might be helpful to host a themed meeting where different jurisdictions share which models they use to help increase capacity for local jurisdictions to successfully apply for these grants.

Julie thanked everyone for this initial conversation and generating these ideas. This will help the workgroup shape the discussions around developing the new workplan. Additionally, she mentioned that it might be beneficial to bring in other workgroups to participate in this meeting as well, and that the workgroup can brainstorm concrete actions that are included in the workplan.

3:25 PM Additional Announcements and Wrap-Up [5 minutes]

Announcements and Opportunities

- [Registration](#) open for Maryland Sea Grant's marsh resilience workshop, "Exploring best practices for large-scale marsh persistence and restoration in the Chesapeake Bay." Workshop is free and occurring on October 6th and has an in-person (College Park, MD) and remote attendance options. **Registration closed Thursday September 15th, 2022. Please email Taryn Sudol at tsudol@umd.edu if interested in attending the workshop.**
- Registration for the [Chesapeake Watershed Forum](#) is open. This in-person forum focuses on sharing successful tools and techniques, offer lessons and learnings from on-the-ground work, build capacities of local organizations, foster partnerships, educate on new initiatives and emerging practices, network among each other, and celebrate successes. This year, Jamileh Soueidan (CRC/NOAA) will be presenting on the STAC Rising Water Temperatures Tidal Management Recommendations.
- Marisa Baldine mentioned that the Executive Council Meeting is on October 11th at EPA Headquarters. The theme of the meeting focuses on looking towards 2025. Please find the registration link and more information [here](#).

3:30 PM Adjourn

Next Meeting: October 17th, 2022 1:30-3:30

Attendance: Adrian Dascalu, Adrienne Kotula, Alex Gunnerson, Allison Ng, Amy Goldfischer, Ben McFarlane, Breck Sullivan, Cassie Davis, Cindy Osorto, Debbie Herr Cornwell, Elizabeth Andrews, Grace Hansen, Jamileh Soueidan, Jason Dubow, Julie Reichert-Nguyen, Katie Brownson, Kate McClure, Kevin Du Bois, Laura Cattell-Noll, Lisa Dosmann, Marisa Baldine, Mark Bennett, Molly Mitchell, Nicole Carlozo, Roxolana Kashuba, Skip Stiles, Sophie Waterman, Taryn Sudol, Taylor Woods

Jamboard from Facilitated Discussion: Capitalizing on Federal Funding Opportunities

Group 1- Julie Reichert-Nguyen

What roles can the workgroup support to better position ourselves to capitalize on the influx of infrastructure spending?

NFWF America the Beautiful; National Funding Award; \$85 Million available; depending on project track \$200,000 to \$5 million per project

NOAA Fisheries; Coastal Habitat Restoration and Resilience Grants for Underserved Communities; National funding; \$10 Million available (~\$250,000-\$500,000 per project).

NFWF Small Watershed Grants; Chesapeake Bay Watershed; ~\$15-25 million available; up to \$500,000 per project depending on project track.

NOAA Fisheries; Transformational Habitat Restoration and Coastal Resilience; National Funding; \$85 Million available (~\$1 million- \$15 million per project).

New England - saltmarsh focus - smart teams - different hubs of expertise - site-specific level - greatly improve scope - match with expertise -

Create (or find??) summary of funding opportunities, including deadlines etc.

NFWF - supporting one of the Bay Program Science Needs - Update science needs

Difficult to keep up with the emerging opportunities - cross-cut of infrastructure spreadsheet - update with Inflation Reduction Act - work with leadership team

Collaborate with the Budget and Finance Workgroup on this?

clearly articulate the value of natural and nature-based projects for climate resilience - to be used in funding applications.

What are the various deadlines?

Be a clearinghouse for opportunities to collaborate and leverage resources for synergistic outcomes

The CBP provides access to federal and state funding experts. Once a project is found, ask the experts.

Identify the project first, then shop around for funding options.

The CRWG can facilitate discussions to identify gaps related to each natural resource and communities - seems like we need to identify gaps in order to identify good grant projects?

Asking WG members which proposals they have submitted to and see how it connects with CRWG efforts - maybe less how to capitalize and more what is already being submitted.

Agree that this space seems ripe to help find collaborations on potential ideas.

Group 2- Jamileh Soueidan

What roles can the workgroup support to better position ourselves to capitalize on the influx of infrastructure spending?

NPWF America the Beautiful; National Funding Award; \$85 Million available; depending on project track \$200,000 to \$5 million per project

NOAA Fisheries; Transformational Habitat Restoration and Coastal Resilience; National Funding; \$85 Million available (~\$1 million- \$15 million per project).

NOAA Fisheries; Coastal Habitat Restoration and Resilience Grants for Underserved Communities; National funding; \$10 Million available (~\$250,000-\$500,000 per project).

NPWF Small Watershed Grants; Chesapeake Bay Watershed; ~\$15-25 million available; up to \$500,000 per project depending on project track.

Nicole Carlozo-
What space do we want to operate in (regional or local)?

Ben McFarlane-
Focusing on local capacity is critical. Helpful for different jurisdictions to share which models they are using to share this capacity. Ways to more uniformly improve capacity (look at states' current approaches)

Local capacity issues: Project management, grant writing, project ID, long-term assistance (+5 years)

Mark Bennett-
should we be working on making sure that folks know where this funding is available?

Nicole Carlozo-
great to have guidance on which grant program would be the best fit for the project (help conserve capacity).

MD list of award and grant programs.

https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1J6_Q_DOQ1gmUyADQ6R22OhA1u9WfQj9BWD2EUx2cHBk/edit#gid=429309504

WWG and Forestry WG- creating a repository of local/state funding programs

Nicole Carlozo- role in creating a guidance document for local partners to find/apply for these funding opportunities

Nicole Carlozo-
developing communications on which projects would be good fits for specific funding programs.