



Climate Resiliency Workgroup Conference Call

Monday, March 19, 2018

1:30 PM – 3:30PM

Conference Line: 202-991-0477 code: 9037008

Adobe Connect: <http://epawebconferencing.acms.com/crwg>

Meeting Website:

https://www.chesapeakebay.net/what/event/climate_resiliency_workgroup_conference_call_march_2018

CBPO Location: 305A

AGENDA

Welcome, Introductions and Announcements (Mark Bennett, USGS; Erik Meyers, The Conservation Fund)

CBP Announcements:

- Release of Final STAC Report:
- Approval of STAC Workshop proposal: [Chesapeake Bay Program Climate Change Modeling 2.0](#)

Zoe Johnson has taken position at the Naval Academy. It will be a while to fill this position and NOAA will appoint staff in detail to temporally fill this position.

The final stac report of [Monitoring and Assessing Impacts of Changes in Weather Patterns and Extreme Events on BMP Siting and Design has been approved](#). The STAC workshop of [Chesapeake Bay Program Climate Change Modeling 2.0](#) has been approved.

Erik announced an April 9 and 10 workshop held in Delaware about thin layer sediment in the Chesapeake Bay. CCMP Chesapeake Research & Modeling Symposium 2018 will be held in June.

MDNR is hosting a State of Coast of conference with a resiliency track 22 and 23 in Cambridge.

Climate Change Indicator Project (Laurel Abowd, CRC)

Objective: *Provide an update on the status of the twenty-one draft climate change indicator implementation plans; identify additional CRWG members to serve as “expert” reviewers for select 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](#)

ERG is helping CRWG to develop 21 indicators and is going through expert review process. A second round of expert review will begin shortly. Comments are welcome from CRWG. Timeline for the first-round expert review is March 23. ERG will turn around before March 28 and the second round of expert review will be due before the end April. The second round of review will be less detailed than the first round and is for fatal flaw.

List of expert reviewers:

Sally Claggett: restore habitat

Ashely Gordon: coastal flooding

Mark: precipitation.

Peter Tango: Stream water temperature; SAV

Nicole Carloze: living shoreline

Erik Myers: wetland migration corridors; protective lands

David Flores: BMPs

This list will be sent out to CRWG members and interested parties to look for additional expert reviewers.

Jennifer asked about the intent of these 21 indicators. Peter responded that the process is to narrow the indicators to 21 which is more equitable with 3 priorities. Insight are needed for some of the indicators but the first 7 is ready to go by the end of March. Mark added that balance will be needed for the final round of peer review. If there are among the indicators and will be interest to pursue the GIT funding

2018 Chesapeake Bay Program Goal Team Funding (Erik Meyers, Conservation Fund)

***Objective:** In anticipation of the availability of 2018 Goal Team funding, explore potential CRWG project ideas. Past projects have included the Climate Smart Decision Framework (2015); the Climate Change Indicator Project (2016); and, the CBP Climate Data and Mapping Repository (2017).*

2018 GIT funding with amount of 25,000 to 30,000 dollars for each GIT with a total of 900,000 dollars. Past projects can be found online. Call thoughts for potential project.

Jen suggested to look over BMP report and relate with BMP siting. Mark added that research related to this topic will probably solve through lit review

Erik proposed research relate to HDFO and methane and white carbon in the Chesapeake Bay region since similar research has been done in California. Jen mentioned that US Climate Alliance has committed to super pollutants which may be a good starting point to contact with.

The timeline to propose the final Goal Team funding will be due in August 2018. RFP will due in May. One or two projects will be funded for each GIT. The proposal will first go to star and with a short priority description.

Mark proposed a lit review on locality of BMPs and design of the BMP and what has been done across the nation. This will be a review on national BMP related to climate.

Climate Resiliency Workgroup Needs for STAR (Melissa Merritt, STAR and CRWG staffer)

Discussion and approval of up to three new priority data needs for 2018. STAR has requested that all 2017 data needs be updated and submitted along with new priority needs by March 15, 2018.

Before Zoe resigned, she proposed two and the first one is climate indicators and the second will be the impacts of SLR, costal storm, increased temperatures and extreme events of on BMP.

Peter asked about if the protocol support should be separated out from the climate indicators.

Mark agreed that this will be a two-part discussion: the data and assessment.

Jen asked if assessing the shelf life of the BMPs is also part of the discussion, and will the maintenance change as a result of the research. Mark agreed.

Peter raised that among the 7 that are developed the stream water temperature, we are finding some challenges with the same dataset, which is from USGS temperature dataset. The way the dataset is stored makes it less accessible than it should be.

Climate Change and the Chesapeake Bay TMDL Midpoint Assessment (Mark Bennett, USGS)

***Objective:** Review March 2, 2018 decisions of the CBP Principals' Staff Committee and discuss next steps, including the role of Climate Resiliency Workgroup in further development of the Sample Narrative Template.*

Support Materials:

- [*CBP Climate Change Policy Provisions for Phase III WIPs \(Draft, March 8, 2018\)*](#)

This report details the guiding principles and the policy provisions. The psc agreed to acknowledge the additional pounds of the nutrient loadings and to incorporate climate change in the WIP3, even though the number from the modeling tools is quite substantial. PSC also charged the CRWG to look at the numbers by 2019 and see if they make sense. There was more discussion in climate than other sectors. The outcome of the policy provisions also outlines the timeline of understanding the science: by 2021 jurisdictions will account for the additional loads in WIP3 addendum. There will be also a potential change with milestone: starting with the 2022 to 2023 milestone.

Jen asked about the phase 3 acknowledge the accumulative amount of nitrogen and phosphorus and how that was

allocated across the jurisdictions. How the allocation has increase the nutrient loading.

Mark responded that PSC do not want to include the breakout into the wip3. There will be no requirement to include them. The accumulative number is just a place holder for the moment. Mark added that there are not a lot of information on how the precipitation affect the BMPs.

David asked if allocating the climate change loading in smaller tributary right now is possible. Mark responded that the data is available on climate change by watershed but it was presented that way.

David also raised the concern of the establishing the stopping rule for the climate modeling work to support the decision making in 2021. How are they going to determine the loading and if there is a stopping rule to prevent the wingle room for jurisdiction to push back. Mark responded that with modeling, there will be always multiple version of model and improvement on the model. He added that based on his experience with CBP, adoptions will be taken by the end of the deadline acknowledging that this is the best effort at that moment.

David further added that accountability is the main concern. Mark responded that 2020 is not that far away and he is unsure whether this number will change by then. This is a question for modeling team and he can send email to Rich Batiuk. David will follow up with Mark on both point after the meeting.

Jen asked considering this is a draft document, when will the final document come out. Mark responded that the policy has been voted by PSC so the policy language is final.

Jen asked if this document should be relied on for WIP3 planning. Mark responded that extra caution is needed for guiding jurisdiction as far as narrative strategy is implementable. This will be up to jurisdictions to determine how comfortable they are with the document. Jen asked if the WIP team in her jurisdiction has received this document, and as Jen sitting in this workgroup, how should she put in jurisdiction input. Mark responded that it is critical for jurisdiction get represented in other workgroups and as well as this workgroup. He added that jurisdictions' input is necessary.

Wrap Up (Erik Meyers, Conservation Fund)

- Call for Content: Chesapeake Resiliency News (April 2018 edition).

Melissa will coordinate the Chesapeake Resiliency news if CRWG members have news to share, they can share them to Melissa or Cuiyin.

Meeting Participants:

Jennifer Dindinger

Cuiyin Wu

Melissa Merritt

Mark Bennet

Erik Myers

Laurel Abowd

Ashley Gordon

Cassandra Davis

Nicole Carlozo

Sally Claggett

James Davis martin

Jennifer De Mooy

Luncida Power

Peter Tango

David Flores