

Management Board Outcome Feedback

- Overall support from signatories for CRWG recommendations
- Wording
 - Change ‘climate’ to ‘environmental change’
 - “climate adaptation” to “adaptation to changing environmental conditions”
 - Monitoring and assessment, change wording to science integration of changing environmental conditions
 - Strong support for considering watershed as a whole, tidal and non-tidal

Monitoring and Assessment

- Majority of Management Board suggested to RECLASSIFY
 - More discussion needed on what this might look like
- Consider other conditions such as public health, flooding; watershed at large and impacts to people
- Don't want to place burden on individual GITS
 - Structure to include dedicated teams that can support science integration
- Overall support for developing a resilience framework for science integration of environmental change

Adaptation

- Inclusive of watershed as a whole
 - Include non-tidal wetlands/streams
- Include tracking of projects across jurisdictions
 - Tracking of changes in watershed that might affect progress towards the outcome in the metrics
- Be clear in wording
 - Focus on adaptation, not mitigation
 - SMART wording needs to encompass the goal
 - Define place-based

Dispositions

OUTCOME	STAR/CRWG DISPOSITION	MB DISPOSITION (Majority)	OUTCOME DIRECTION	EXPERTS NEEDED
Monitoring & Assessment	REPLACE	RECLASSIFY	Instead of tracking changing trends of precip, temp, and SLR, integrate existing environmental change science across outcomes to inform attainability	Data analysts; modelers; scientists with topical expertise
Adaptation	UPDATE	UPDATE	Keep core concept; incorporate holistic watershed approach that includes tidal and nontidal areas; identify and implement nature-based adaptation options; make SMART by considering place-based approach with measurable and timebound targets	Resiliency practitioners/ implementers; applied and social scientists; jurisdictions

Questions

- Monitoring and Assessment
 - New name - Environmental Change Science Integration?
 - If reclassified, what would that look like structure and governance-wise? In-house environmental change data science team? Signatories signing up their staff to help? Separate facilitation and technical support teams?
- Adaptation
 - How to pick place-based areas to focus on?
 - Build from marsh adaptation focus areas? Align with shallow water living resource assessment? Focus on areas that has the most nontidal and tidal collaboration? Align with jurisdiction priority areas?
 - How to not lose momentum of current coastal resiliency partner engagement if we expand work to include nontidal portions of the watershed?
 - Which GIT? New GIT? Do we need separate tidal and nontidal groups? Who would be the nontidal partners?