



Climate Resiliency Workgroup (CRWG) Meeting

Monday, October 29, 2018
10:00 AM –3:00 PM Full Workgroup

Meeting Materials:

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

Minutes

Thematic Focus: Climate Resiliency Research Agenda and Workplan

10:00 **Welcome, Introductions & Announcements** (Co-Chair Mark Bennett, USGS and Co-Chair Erik Meyers, The Conservation Fund)

CBP Announcements:

Update on WIPS Climate Narrative (Mark Bennett, USGS, Jen Dopkowski, NOAA)

- Jen added no additional comments from Management Board. The WQ GIT had changes earlier, and having gone thru the MB, it is now final.
- Mark added that the STAC workshop, [Chesapeake Bay Program Climate Change Modeling 2.0](#), was a productive meeting. Rachel Dixon added that there was feedback from the workshop for near and long-term future items.
- Zoe asked about the status of SLR projections. Mark added that this topic has been moved back until Jan until the workgroup can get their workplan together.
- Ben added that there are report cards based on regression analysis. They've picked a 1960s or 1970s trend line, and there is a curve. Ben can send these reportcards out to the group. Zoe added that the most important thing here is how the model responds to SLR, not so much the actual SLR number.

10:15 **Climate Resiliency Working Group Newsletter** (Rebecca Chillrud, CRC)

Objective: Provide an update on the quarterly Climate Resiliency Working Group Newsletter and deadlines for future newsletters

- The CRWG has a quarterly newsletter that will be published one more time for 2018. Please send all content to Rebecca rchillrud@chesapeakebay.net.
- Rebecca Chillrud volunteered to take over the CRWG newsletter: Oct. Jan. April. July will be the next quarterly month dates.
- This issue will be sent by Oct 31.
- Zoe added that there are many listservs that can provide useful information. Zoe will send this information to Rebecca.
- Rebecca added that she will add her contact info at the bottom of the newsletter for folks to continue to send content.
- Krista Romita Grocholski from RAND will also connect with Rebecca about connecting information.

10:30 **Chesapeake Bay Climate Data and Mapping Portal** (Chris Lamie, ERG, Angie Wei, CBP, John Wolf, USGS)

Objective: Provide an update on the Portal's draft implementation plan, timeline and next steps

- [See presentation.](#)
- Chris Lamie reviewed the purpose and process for this mapping portal project.
- This project will come back to the workgroup around January 2019 for input.
- Jen Dindinger asked about the target audience and user group that would most access this information? Chris responded that it's a mix of internal and external users looking for information on a particular topic. John added that many of the partners already have these types of portals. These datasets, as well as housing them, will help the CBPO to learn this type of project for future work.
- Erik asked how this info is updated and maintained. John responded that many of these entries will be pointing towards the original source data. Erik asked if there's a way to continually update the sources of data, or new sources as needed? John added that the input from CRWG will be useful in this case. Chris continued that for the maintenance plan, an annual view for currency will be beneficial.
- Jennifer DeMooy asked about state-specific data. John confirmed that this information is more watershed-wide geography.
- Angie Wei also reviewed the data hub online. There are many features, including searching topics by GITs, and an extensive list of keywords.
- Lew Linker will talk with John Wolf about more datasets that relate to modeling. Lew asked about references and literature for topics. There is a specific air deposition topic that this might be particularly useful. John responded that it's hard to find scientific information on the CBPO website, so it's understandable to add pertinent information here. Whether cataloged pdfs would be best housed on this repository is the question, however.
- Lew suggested adding intensity and river flow as one of the topics.

10:45 **Climate Change Indicators** (Chris Lamie, ERG)

Objective: Provide an update on the publication of the final Climate Change indicators, as well as an update to the one page fact sheet

- [Scroll to the end of this attached document to see this presentation.](#) There are a suite of 21 indicators that made the final cut in this project. Chris reviewed the deliverables from this project, now that it has wrapped up.

11:00 **Communications Workgroup GIT Funded Proposal** (Rebecca Chillrud, CRC, Jim George, MDE)

Objective: Provide an update on the Communications Workgroup GIT funded proposal including a request for participation in their action team

- Rebecca reviewed this project entitled, “Social marketing to improve shoreline management”
- Bids are due Jan 31st 2019. Reviews will be submitted in February 2019. The project will begin in March 2019. The Comms workgroup will form an action team for guiding this project, which will need CRWG input in January. An email will be sent out asking for volunteers. Jim George added that a similar effort was done for wetlands through farmland. This is a three-state project: MD, VA, DE. It will help to provide a statistical basis from surveys to help persuade policy makers.
- Jen Dindinger added that VA coastal zone folks have a very thorough social marketing campaign as well, which should be helpful for this project. Jen also worked on the wetland social marketing campaign that Jim mentioned, and this project may also have useful information. Jen offered her time on the action committee.
- Kevin Du Bois asked if the RFP will include information to ask for respondents be knowledgeable of existing work? Rebecca added that the RFP will ask for respondents to have social marketing experience, and then a list of suggested resources for them to familiarize themselves with.
- Elizabeth added that a [paper was posted re: legal policy recommendations for shoreline work](#). It can be found here.
- Jennifer DeMooy wanted to confirm that this will include marine contractors as well as property owners? Rebecca confirmed that yes, marine contractors are one of their audiences.
- Lew asked if certain reports would be included for future strategic planning? Zoe added that this report was probably included in the implementation plan for the shoreline change indicator.

11:15 CBP Climate Research Needs (Mark Bennett, USGS, Jen Dopkowski, NOAA)

Objective: As an outcome of the Climate Resiliency Working Group’s SRS presentation, the Management Board has requested the CRWG compile a prioritized list of Climate Research Needs for the Chesapeake Bay Program. The CRWG will discuss and prioritize a draft list of these research needs.

Support Materials: Research Needs survey (to be circulated prior to the meeting)

- A Climate Change Research Agenda for the Chesapeake Bay Program Partnership Prepared by STAR’s Climate Resiliency Workgroup (CRWG) Draft 01.05.17
 - STAC Workshop Summary Report Monitoring Efforts for Blue Crab, Submerged Aquatic Vegetation and Oysters
 - [Summary of Recent Research on Effects of Climate Change in the Chesapeake Bay](#)
- When Mark presented at the SRS presentation for CRWG, the MB asked for a prioritized list of climate research in general. This will be given to the STAC December meeting, which will then be given to the MB once again.
 - There was discussion about the voting on research needs. 17 members voted. This survey will need to come out again. Any items that were ranked high can be re-scored in a second survey. Mark suggested weighting the votes to help provide granularity to let these research topics settle out clearly.
 - Zoe added that some of these might need to be lumped a bit. Thematic areas? Mark agreed that this lumping might need to be done, but it can be done after the first round of survey results. Maybe it would be better to let STAC weigh in on the timeline of when research could be

accomplished. Other workgroup members agreed that it was difficult to include timeline in the ranking of research needs. Rachel agreed that STAC can inform on the timeline. STAC can provide agreement on emphasis for higher priority research needs.

- Nicole Carlozo added that there might need to be a “why” to explain respondents’ choices. Add a “note” section to the survey.
- Jennifer DeMooy suggested organizing based on similar categories to the indicators project.
- Zoe suggested that this survey could be posted for other GIT coordinators and staffers to take as well, giving them one vote each.
- If any member would like to re-vote, this survey can be left open one more week. The second survey can be ready and posted before we meet again in November.
- MB would like a January update (Jan 17 next meeting) on this prioritization.

12:15 **Lunch (Leeward Market Order or on your own)**

12:45 **Developing the CRWG Workplan** (Laura Drescher, EPA, Mark Bennett, USGS, Jen Dopkowski, NOAA)

Objective: Provide a timeline for developing the CRWG two year workplan as well as discuss content and focus areas for The Climate Resiliency Working Group workplan

Support Materials: Previous workplan as well as timeline for upcoming deliverables

2:45 **Wrap-Up** (Co-Chair Mark Bennett, USGS and Co-Chair Erik Meyers, The Conservation Fund)

- Mark started the discussion of moving forward with a workplan and our workgroup actions. In the previous years, this workgroup hasn’t focused as much on the adaptation side, but more on the modeling. So this year we can focus on adaptation.
- There were four areas previously discussed: Shoreline Condition and Response, WQ and Climate Effects on BMPs, Impact of Inland and Urban Flooding, Stream health condition, and Jen also added marine debris for today’s discussion. However, it was decided that marine debris would instead go under shoreline condition and response.
- Mark prompted, what can the workgroup do to help others that are working on these efforts? Mark made the suggestion that we may need the researchers on the phone to give presentations to allow us to determine the assistance we can provide and put in our workplan.
- Erik asked if there is a good mapping resource where adaptation projects are located? The USACE did a study that pulled this information together.
- Nicole asked at what stage was the shoreline condition indicator in? Jen responded that the data exists, but indicator must be defined, according to the report from the Climate Indicators project.
- Erik suggested following the social marketing GIT funded project, since most likely action items will come out of that project wrapping up. While we don’t know what those action items will be, it may not be needed to list them.
- Other indicators in the next stage: Acidification, Urban Tree Canopy, Wetland Extent and physical buffering, but none of these really touch on adaptation.

- Erik asked about living resources and impacts to commercially important species. These species bring attention and influence on policy for protection. We could word our workplan around these species.
- Zoe added that it's hard to determine the tasks that this workgroup does on its own, vs what needs to be done in partnership with other GITs that they take the lead on. This causes confusion on who takes ownership and the lead on next steps.
- Zoe suggested that it's up to workgroup members to really determine what they would like to see for their state, what actions they could help with this group to help.
- Jennifer DeMooy added that, of the four items previously discussed, Inland and Urban flooding as well as WQ and Climate effects on BMPs are the most related to adaptation. Mark followed up that this really lends itself to bringing in experts to speak to these issues. Jennifer added that information sharing can really help practitioners. Erik agreed that looking at other coastal areas and their projects would be beneficial.
- Ben MacFarland also agreed, especially coming from Hampton Roads- they do this similar info sharing. There is also more monitoring needed for BMPs. Also, the fact that the Bay Program would list some of these priorities can provide influence for future funding, even if no funding is available currently.
- Ben continued that hazard mitigation is also a big area. Erik added that we as a workgroup can tee up a research topic to facilitate buy in for funding by other groups. Zoe added that this could take the form of facilitated discussion on predetermined topics that are in the four thematic areas.
- Kevin Du Bois added that there needs to be a great awareness of co-benefits.
- Jennifer added that integrating a cost-benefit analysis (which is usually required with jurisdiction projects) with co-benefits is so far very difficult. Ben added that this could be a project- a better way to quantify what these benefits are. Erik agrees that this would be very useful.
- Erik added that citizen boards and their influence could be impacted by the social marketing work. To focus on how to communicate climate change and information.
- Zoe and Jen Dindinger talked about matching our workplan with the logic table we created for the Strategy Review System. Jen also added that the Climate Narrative that was just approved for jurisdictions may also spell out some work for our group as well.
- Kevin Du Bois: If we could get VIMS' assistance, he believes it would be a powerful study to look at permit decisions that did not adopt a living shoreline (when one was possible) and calculate an approximate value of N & P reductions lost because of the choice for shoreline hardening.
- Jennifer DeMooy asked if there were other venues where these information sharing sessions could happen?
- Nicole added that these info sessions could contribute to fact sheets or informational sheets to provide guidance to jurisdictions that want to do similar things.
- Ben asked if our meetings could be set up as special workshops in larger spaces to allow for more people to gather on topic-specific sessions? Mark added that we can move our meetings to other venues to accommodate more participants.
- Zoe added this group could co-host with other groups who are doing similar work.
- Jennifer Dindinger: Just wanted to add that I agree with Jennifer's points about finding additional creative ways to communicate within and across our agencies and target audiences.

- Mark added that thematic areas sounds very conducive to the work. Ben suggested that inviting the other GITs to these workgroups will also help shape our discussions.
- Jennifer DeMooy suggested partnering with Antioch University for a regional adaptation conference for the Bay region. This is a gap that is currently not being filled.
- Mark summarized that our original 4 topic areas are still viable as they leave no glaring gaps in coverage.
- Zoe suggested we go through the old workplan and find any items that weren't completed that also tie in to our four thematic areas.
- Laura commented that there are a few things that should be updated in the management strategy regardless. There is a list that includes these changes: such as lessons gleaned from the SRS analysis, and that the management strategy aligns with the logic table presented to the Management Board.
- Jen Dopkowski added that maybe 5-8 actions could be brainstormed under each thematic area.
- Possible action items: Themed meetings, partnering with other workgroups, following up with Social marketing project, Mapping repository project, Climate Smart tool, two facilitated workshops on climate smart, update of climate change research agenda, regarding BMPs- see if there are any specific recommendations from the STAC workshop to determine if this workgroup could take any, any recommendations for the new building if the CBP is moved. To also re-engage, state adaptation planning presentations would be helpful (also along the lines of the climate WIP guidance).
- Jim George added that in order to focus on the Climate Smart tool, it might be smart to engage with previous workgroups that have worked with us on this tool to help continue engagement.
- Jen agreed that we (leadership of CRWG) can begin to craft a workplan with this feedback.
- A draft of this workplan is required Dec 17. Final management strategy is due in March 2019. There is no fixed starting date, meaning it's fair to include anything in the workplan since presentation Aug 2018 thru Aug 2020.
- Laura added that a near final version go to Jan or Feb meeting of STAR, to ensure review and everyone is comfortable with this workplan for public comment and Management Board.
- Nov 19 will have a draft of the workplan. Dec 17 will finalize this document. Jan 24 STAR meeting presentation of this document.

Next Meeting Dates:

- November 19 1:30-3:30 PM (conference call)
- December 17 1:30-3:30 PM (conference call)

Participants: Jen Dopkowski, Krista Romita Grocholski, Mark Bennett, Erik Meyers, Adrienne Kotula, Nicole Carlozo, Jen Dindinger, Jim George, Rachel Dixon, Peter Tango, Ben Macfarland, Angie Wei, John Wolf, Kevin Du Bois, Chris Lamie, Rebecca Chillrud, Jennifer DeMooy, Lew Linker, Cassandra Davis, Jeremy Hanson, Molly Mitchell, Laura Drescher, Melissa Merritt