



## Climate Resiliency Workgroup Conference Call

Monday, August 20, 2018

1:30 PM – 3:30PM

Meeting Website:

[https://www.chesapeakebay.net/what/event/climate\\_resiliency\\_workgroup\\_august\\_conference\\_call](https://www.chesapeakebay.net/what/event/climate_resiliency_workgroup_august_conference_call)

CBPO Location: **Fishshack**

### Minutes

#### 1:30 **Welcome, Introductions and Announcements** ( Jennifer Dopkowski, NOAA)

##### **CBP Announcements:**

- STAC Workshop [Chesapeake Bay Program Climate Change Modeling 2.0](#), Annapolis, MD Sep 24-25, 2018.
- [American Geophysical Union](#), Washington, DC. December 10-14, 2018.
- [Coastal and Estuarine Research Federation](#), November 3-7, 2019. Mobile, AL. Session proposals should be developed soon.

#### 1:35 **Partner Announcements** (CRWG Members)

Jen Dindinger- Kate McClure is the new Coastal Climate Specialist with UMD Sea Grant Extension.  
Peter Tango- Maryland Water Monitoring Council conference in Dec 7. Registration open now.

#### 1:45 **Strategy Review System Presentation: Feedback from the Management Board** ( Jennifer Dopkowski, NOAA)

The Strategy Review System (SRS) occurs every two years to provide workgroups the opportunity to look at Outcome progress, as well as identify obstacles and opportunities. The CRWG presented this information to the Management Board on August 9. This presentation will update workgroup members on the feedback received from the Management Board. Jen will be going over upcoming deadlines/deliverables for the updates to the workplan and management strategy (due on Dec 12, 2018).

List of proposed four topics for the adaptation outcome

- Shoreline condition and response;
- Climate change on BMP;
- Inland and urban flooding;
- Stream health condition

**Request for Discussion:** *if these are the right topics to focus on moving forward to update the workplan, management strategy and logic table*

The climate outcomes were presented to the Management board on Aug 9, with follow up actions presented for the next Management Board meeting. One of these actions was to work on the draft climate narrative for phase III WIPs. with a deadline for Sept 4 to be turned in to the Management Board for comment. The WQ GIT is directly sending comments on this document. This document will then be provided to the MB meeting on Sept 13 for approval.

ACTION: \*\*This narrative will be sent to the workgroup.

Jen Dindinger asked about jurisdictions incorporating climate change into their WIPs until 2021. Jen clarified that this document will be a narrative template, not a numerical component. This document will be sent out as soon as approved for jurisdictions to include it into their phase III WIP drafting.

Jennifer DeMooy added that this document was drafted when there was uncertainty whether the PSC

would go for a qualitative or quantitative version. So this template was viewed as a placeholder, with no metrics added for another two to three years. Zoe added that *\*if\** jurisdictions want to adopt a qualitative or quantitative approach, this template would help.

Jen reviewed the Management Board feedback. Jen will reach out with Rachel Dixon with STAC to put together short term and long term options on how the MB could advance the recommendations for BMP siting and design data/research needs. This is due by the end of the month.

Regarding the prioritized needs for use by citizen science programs, this is a long term request, which will involve other workgroups to achieve (ie STAR).

Regarding the promotion of utilization of CBP Climate Smart Framework- Kristin Saunders will help with this promotion. This tool will also be added into the SRS guiding documents to encourage GITS to consult the tool before updating management strategies and work plans.

Jen continued that work is starting on this next set of deliverables for the MB September meeting. The conversation needs to start re: the review of what we've put into the workplan and logic table currently, and how we'll move forward.

Zoe asked about if the MB confirmed the four topic areas that the CRWG originally discussed? Mark had presented these topics with the idea that they needed more discussion to firm them up. But the MB was supportive of narrowing the workplan as well as supporting topic areas moving forward.

Kevin Du Bois asked to clarify the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> bullets.

1. Shoreline condition and response
2. Climate change on BMP
3. Inland and Urban flooding
4. Stream health condition.

Zoe responded that each of these bullets have their own nuances that the CRWG could focus on separately. While agreement is useful to have on these four areas, the biggest discussion will focus on the actions that will go in the workplan for these topics.

There was discussion about these four areas- Amanda Campbell added that the inland and urban flooding bullet was important to keep because it reflects some of the interplay between Chesapeake bay restoration activities and impacts to communities and the economy. Whereas the bullet about impacts of climate change on BMP performance goes one-way, in other cases, BMPs or wetlands or tree planting or other green infrastructure revitalization can reduce the impacts of climate change, such as inland flooding, on both the bay and the built environment/communities. Amanda believes the four work well and it isn't necessary to parse them too much at this point because they all have overlapping causes and solutions.

Amanda continued that the broader need to recognize that efforts to mitigate the impacts of climate change on the bay (whether shorelines, BMPs, streams, or flooding) have ancillary benefits for the economy and for communities that benefit from BMPs or depend on the bay. There may likely be some benefit to coordinating with other sectors on climate adaptation activities such as hazard mitigation, protecting vulnerable populations, health, economic development, recreation, water and wastewater, etc.

Peter added that shoreline condition and response connects our initiatives with many of the other GITS with their goals and outcomes.

Jen followed up that we will return to this topic again, to help meet the December 14 deadline.

## **2:00      2018 Chesapeake Bay Program Goal Team Funding**

**Background:** GIT Funding Ideas: Goal Team Funding for 2018 will once again become available, with funding for projects within the \$25-\$75k range. Proposals will be due around the end of May. Past projects for the CRWG include the Climate Smart Decision Framework, the Climate Change Indicator Projects, and the CBP Climate Data and Mapping Repository.

The Chesapeake Bay Trust has gathered reviews for the GIT funding project: “Climate-Resilient BMP” Indicator Project” - David Flores. Revisions to project ideas and the final documents should be submitted to [Greg Allen](#) and [Emily Freeman](#) by **COB Thursday, August 23**. They are looking at a date of Thursday, September 20 for the GIT Chairs, Coordinators, and Staffers to meet and rank all proposals. The full packet of project ideas will be sent out no later than two weeks ahead of that meeting, once a date is finalized.

**Support Materials:**

- a. “Climate-Resilient BMP” Indicator Project” with feedback from GIT

There is question about who qualifies as a Technical lead for our GIT funding project proposals. Susan Julius is offered to be the Technical Project Lead. Zoe added that anybody can be the project lead. This includes a review of invoices, finalizing the scope of work, and keeping the work on track. This includes anybody in the workgroup.

Susan Julius has offered to help, but not to be the sole lead.

Peter asked about the proposed project and how it reads a bit like a STAC workshop proposal. STAC workshops are usually around \$10,000. This project is asking for \$75,000. Susan Julius added that this project will take a lot more pre-workshop work that would easily push the cost beyond \$50k, from her experience.

Peter also asked about input for indicators. Susan responded that the work will include looking at the potential areas of metrics that can be used to then whittle them down to the priorities that are more doable. So the metrics that would come to the workshop would be a smaller subset of indicators with supporting metrics.

Jennifer asked about the timeline for this project. Jen responded that the review would occur around Sept 20. The awarded contracts will be notified in December. January will be the start of the project. Jen confirmed that Nov 28 is the time when RFP is due from contractors.

**2:30 Climate Change Indicator Project (Peter Tango, USGS)**

**Objective:** Provide an update on the status of the twenty-one draft climate change indicator implementation 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](#)

At the end of July, the implementation plans for the 21 indicators chosen were delivered by the contractor. For six indicators, the CBP Communications team is currently working on [chesapeakeprogress.com](http://chesapeakeprogress.com) for publication. For the upcoming Bay Barometer publication, these indicators will be published as a feature set of indicators. The final updates and data for this Bay Barometer publication is Oct 12.

There has been a protocol change in a dataset for a couple of these indicators, so instead of publishing immediately, we’re waiting to see how the protocol change will affect the indicator. This may be just a delay in publishing for these few indicators.

Frederika asked for a reminder about the 21 indicators, how will they be used? Peter added that within the framework of indicators at the CBP, there have been crosscutting needs, and its anticipated that any and all of the workgroups/GITs can use this information to explain the trends in their own progress in meeting their goals and outcomes. It’s making the information available for the other GITs to use to support their needs.

**3:00 Updating Workgroup Participants Email Addresses and Expertise (Jennifer Dopkowski, NOAA)**

Be on the lookout for an email from us to update our members’ emails and area of expertise.

**3:15 Wrap Up**

For the September meeting, the group will be notified of topics ahead of time.

## Participants

Jen Dopkowski, Peter Tango, Melissa Merritt, Ashley Gordon, Jen Dindinger, Molly Mitchell, Nicole, Susan Julius, Jennifer DeMooy, Nicole Carlozo, Kevin Dubois, Zoe Johnson, Cindy Johnson, Melissa Deas, Frederika Moser, Carl Friedrichs, Amanda Campbell, Adrienne Kotula,

Dopkowski	Jennifer	NOAA	jennifer.dopkowski@noaa.gov
Merritt	Melissa	CRC	mmerritt@chesapeakebay.net
Tango	Peter	USGS/CBPO	ptango@chesapeakebay.net
Carlozo	Nicole	MDNR	nicole.carlozo@maryland.gov
DeMooy	Jennifer	DE DNREC	jennifer.demooy@state.de.us
<a href="#">Dindinger</a>	Jennifer	UMD	jdinding@umd.edu
Julius	Susan	EPA-ORD/STAC	julius.susan@epa.gov
Mitchell	Molly	VIMS	molly@vims.edu
Moser	Fredricka	MD Sea Grant	moser@mdsg.umd.edu
Campbell	Amanda	MWCOG	<a href="mailto:acampbell@mwcog.org">acampbell@mwcog.org</a>
Friedrichs	Carl		carl.friedrichs@vims.edu
Gordon	Ashley	<a href="#">Hampton Roads Planning District Commission</a>	agordon@hrpdcva.gov
Johnson	Cindy	VA DEQ	williams.michelle@epa.gov
Johnson	Zoe		zoe.johnson1@navy.mil
Kotula	Adrienne	VA Chesapeake Bay Commission	<a href="mailto:akotula@chesbay.us">akotula@chesbay.us</a>
Lockwood	Trieste	VADEQ	-
Dubois	Kevin	DoD CBP Coordinator	<a href="mailto:kevin.dubois@navy.mil">kevin.dubois@navy.mil</a>
Deas	Melissa	DOEE	<a href="mailto:Melissa.Deas@dc.gov">Melissa.Deas@dc.gov</a>