

DRAFT Meeting Minutes - Pending Working Group Approval

Adaptation & Resiliency Working Group Meeting

Virtual Meeting | February 9, 2022 | 2:00p - 4:00p

I. Welcome, Introductions & Review of Agenda 2:00 - 2:10

Secretary Haddaway-Riccio (DNR), will open the meeting, call roll and review the agenda.

- a. Action: Member approval of November 8 Meeting Minutes via vote
- b. Materials: November 8, 2021 draft meeting notes

Motion for approval of minutes, Erik Meyers. Second, Jason Dubow. Minutes approved with no abstention.

II. Resilience Funding Opportunities - NFWF 2:10 - 2:25

Jake Reilly from NFWF will share perspectives on the expanded resilience focus of the Chesapeake Programs including types of projects they are seeking and how Maryland partners or communities can tap into the National Coastal Resilience Program.

- a. Action: Discussion will inform development of work plan on “Increasing Capacity to Compete for Natural Infrastructure Funds”
- Three leg stool story of resilience for NFWF: 1) History of supporting resilience; 2) How prospective infrastructure funding is informing future opportunities; 3) New federal partnerships giving opportunity to hone in on resiliency as a core strategy. Their scaled work on resiliency started with Hurricane Sandy, early 2010s. Some of the projects are still being wrapped up. This established the national approach. Emergency Coastal Resilience Fund, has been a \$30 million dollar program, with infrastructure bills increasing to \$100 million. Aim is to support scaled planning and assessment work to deliver natural and nature based solutions for FEMA communities and for critical species and habitats, as well as implementation projects. Information on NFWF's National Coastal Resilience Fund:
<https://www.nfwf.org/programs/national-coastal-resilience-fund?activeTab=tab-1>. 2022 NCRF Request for proposals should be opening in March.
- Increase in funding forthcoming and allows expansion into emerging topics (resiliency, adaptation) - means more projects, more types of projects that are able to be funded. 2022 Small Watershed Grant Proposal solicitation was released February 8-
<https://www.nfwf.org/programs/chesapeake-bay-stewardship-fund/small-watershed-grants-2022-request-proposals>.
 - Resilience is now explicitly called out in this solicitation. These funds are dedicated for the Chesapeake Bay, and may be more viable for application than the national programs. Organization is pulling back from match requirements for these projects. Will help lower resourced communities and help with capacity.
- Anticipating a new program coming online - Chesapeake WILD, potentially unprecedented opportunities for Maryland the communities to tap into resources.
- Taking a broad view of resilience. Not just coastal flood resilience - looking at marsh migration, salt tolerant species considerations, expanding urban tree canopy work that gets both stormwater and other benefits, and soil health.
- Looking forward to working with and through ARWG as key conduits to local communities - communities themselves and the NGOs working in communities.

- **Q:** Funding typically goes to local governments / boots on the ground. Can you speak more on what / how a state agency could engage with the funding opportunities. **A:** Primary EPA funded programs - 1) small watershed opportunity - not open to state governments, there is a planning track that allows communities to start doing the technical work they want to do and engage with. State opportunities at the planning track, but looking for the community scale work and collaboration. Smaller awards, typically under \$75K. 2) Innovative Nutrient Sediment program - state agencies are qualified for these funds. MDA received an award a few years ago to implement soil health.
 - Just a note based on previous questions that state agencies are eligible applicants under NFWF's National Coastal Resilience Fund which also has four funding categories for projects at different stages including Community Capacity Building and Planning, Site Assessment and Preliminary Design, Final Design and Permitting, and then Restoration and Monitoring
- **Q:** Will the Chesapeake Bay-designated funding allow for developing designs with nature-based infrastructure projects. Many communities need help developing the design (e.g., listening session with community to identify projects, hiring engineer to design plan, etc.)? **A:** Yes, planning track that explicitly has no match required. See it as a way for the community to get their foot in the door, can be the community directly or an NGO working with the community. Great opportunity to help start the conversation in communities who have an idea, and this allows them to start putting resources behind it.
- **Q:** Are you interested in supporting a dialogue around the imperfect fit of permitting programs. Interested in looking at (with the USACE) that would look more specifically at natural solutions to better align. **A:** Interested in this conversation; they are responsible to the federal agencies to ensure the money is spent, so having discussions about permitting would be beneficial. Can provide examples of how the permit process as is, does not allow for expedient deployment of funds in a way they are needed.
- **Q:** How can we strengthen connections between the capacity to do resilience and working lands? **A:** Historical focus on water quality work and nutrient management has oriented what the technical community is focusing on. Need to be engaging technical providers more directly especially around what resiliency looks like in a working lands environment. Conversation can be more than “how can you comply with your nutrient management plan” but “how can you better manage your resources in the event of climate disruptions.”

III. Urban Tree Program - Chesapeake Bay Trust

2:25 - 2:45

The Maryland General Assembly passed the [Tree Solutions Now Act of 2021](#), calling for 5 million trees to be planted over eight years, with 500,000 of them targeted to urban, underserved areas. The Chesapeake Bay Trust (the Trust) was identified as the administrator of the urban tree component, distributing grants to communities, neighborhoods, civic groups, schools, and others who commit to planting trees in underserved regions as defined in the legislation. *Greg Burks* from the Chesapeake Bay Trust will be providing an update on the effort.

- a. **Action:** Discussion will inform development of work plan on “Increasing Capacity to Compete for Natural Infrastructure Funds”
 - b. **Materials:** [Urban Tree Grant Program Website](#)
- Chesapeake Trust - grant making organization created by the Maryland legislature in the 1980s. CBT funds come from the Chesapeake Bay license plates. Manage funds from 30 other partners (organizations and government agencies). Offer capacity building, environmental ed, restoration and other funding opportunities.

- Urban Tree Grant Program and Tree Solutions Now Act of 2021: define key areas that build the grant program. State is seeking to plant and maintain 5 million native trees by the end of calendar year 2031. The bill specifically calls for MDE, DNR and MDA to play key roles in all stages of the effort. These 5 million trees are in addition to plantings already identified in the GGRA. CBT is tasked with creating a grant program to plant 500,000 trees in urban areas beginning in FY23. RFP is currently out, deadline March 3 - 4pm. Funding can be used for anything that leads to trees getting into the ground: site work, labor, personnel cost, and any other expenses related to planting and maintaining trees in underserved urban areas. CBT has been working with partners to ensure the RFP is considering all key components of planting trees in urban areas. Trees can go to public or private land, playgrounds, right of ways, etc. Requirement for community engagement in the effort, helps with maintenance as the communities have buyin, and have the communities weigh in what species of trees they want. Key of this effort is survivability for the trees.
- Urban is defined in the legislation as areas with low median household income levels, high unemployment, any neighborhood where there is a housing project or historical redlining. Legislation is explicit in the areas these trees should be planted in. Urban areas have historically been harmed by the lack of tree canopy, and this legislation allows those communities to reap the benefits of trees (health, environment, climate).
- Community engagement and capacity building is key to the success of this effort. CBT is engaging in traditional approaches (door knocking), attending community meetings and really working to understand what the needs of the community are - what do they need to get the trees into the ground? Ongoing effort to match needs with capacity - who needs what kind of help and who has that help to offer.
- **Q:** Does the funding include provisions for acquiring the land for planting? **A:** No, the RFP does not allow for procurement of the land.
- **Q:** How can we help local governments to get the word out to communities, residents, religious institutions, etc. **A:** CBT has a large network and are doing the best, but they are always asking for support to continue to spread the word out.
 - Link to the RFP:
- **Q:** What resources are available from the Trust for organizations who say they want to receive the funds but don't have the capacity to submit? **A:** CBT would provide support to the organization to walk through the application process, identify where they need support, and provide it. Additionally, have identified other organizations that are available to help with proposal submissions.
- **Q:** Can you share your community spreadsheets? **A:** Reach out to Greg Burks for coordination on community groups, and outreach strategies for alignment.
- **Q:** Is there funding available for long term monitoring, maintenance and replacement of the trees? **A:** 2 years of maintenance (includes watering, mulching, climbing invasives) all of the necessary components that help the tree get to year 3. CBT is incorporating adaptive management into their RFP and will change the RFP as the years go on to better meet needs.
- **Q:** Broadly, for the 5 million trees - is there an issue with nursery stock / inventory of trees to keep up with the planting, both within MD's legislation, the GGRA and the federal initiatives? **A:** State of MD is expanding capacity for nursery stock, and has additional room to expand. There is an increased need for seed collection and Maryland will be hiring 13 positions to help with this need. The CBT grant program has no requirements for the size of tree - so you can request any size, and the specific tree will be reviewed in the technical review. MD Forestry and State Nursery team has been extremely proactive in preparing for this increased need. MDE will be responsible for tracking and monitoring, DNR playing a role in coordination and support at all stages



IV. 2022 Recommendations & Work Plan Discussion

2:45 - 3:50

ARWG had four key recommendations included in the 2021 MCCC Annual Report. Including the report card in today's discussion even though it is not a 2022 priority, but trying to understand how the indicators will be used to inform our work (the Report Card development was a priority strategy in 2021 and 2020, the report card was released January 2022). Focus of discussion: how to approach the topics, receiving updates, ideas from WG members, identification of key topics for discussion or strategies to achieve our goals.

- A. 2021 Maryland Coastal Adaptation Report Card. *Lead: Katie May Laumann (UMCES)*
 - a. Action: ARWG members will provide input on which indicators are of highest priority to address via the work plan.
 - b. Materials: [2021 Maryland Coastal Adaptation Report Card](#)
 - UMCES worked with over 100 indicators to identify key indicators of interest and identify data sources. Overall score is a B-, Maryland is making progress but there is still work to be done.
 - Question to ARWG: Looking at the indicators, seeing where we are succeeding or need work - do members see any key indicator that ARWG would be able to intervene on these indicators to improve the score, or how we might be able to use the report card to inform prioritization of activities going forward.
 - Intersection of the Framework and the Report Card. Five sectors in the Framework correspond well with the four areas that have the indicators. Might be able to provide information to improve the indicators. Will take time to align them well but it is worth it to improve the indicators.
 - **Q**: Wetlands section - the metrics for evaluating if the state met the goal? Is there more information or data about why it's being scored as meeting that goal? **A**: WOody and emergent wetlands in Maryland Coastal Counties from NOAA - data from 2006 and 2011. From that data, there was no net loss in any of the counties. **Q**: Any plans to update the assessment or is there more data available? Interested in the # now. **A**: No more recent data available yet, but UMCES is looking for more funding to update the scores and process more recent data.
 - **Q**: How or where does heat factor into these indicators? **A**: heat and temperature were not indicators in this assessment. The Report Card is only assessing the coastal zone in Maryland and by nature of the geographic scope, non-heat indicators rose to a higher priority than heat. Not to diminish the impact of heat on the coastal zone.
 - Might be existing data for critical facilities that can be linked to the flood mapping, would be well within ARWG's priority with community engagement and adaptation planning. Per KML - maps are available now as part of the 2021 Hazard Mitigation Plan but were not at the time of analysis.
 - Should we be thinking about quantitative goals to set in an attempt to achieve different parts of the Adaptation Framework?
 - **Key takeaway**: Interest to align with the Framework, and also align ARWG work to inform future report cards and indicators in the future, and also address indicator gaps and try to identify what additional indicators would be useful to measure adaptation progress.
 -
- B. Adaptation Framework. *Lead: Matt Fleming (DNR)*
 - a. Action: Receive and review the Framework to begin identifying an approach to action prioritization to inform a Resilience Roadmap for the next 3 -5 years of workgroup action.
 - b. Materials: FINAL Maryland Climate Adaptation and Resilience Framework

Recommendations: 2021 - 2030.

- Framework is not meant to be a standalone document or a document to be implemented by the ARWG in its entirety. ARWG in coordination with the MCCC needs to evaluate the recommendations to inform our work plans. Asking ARWG to read, review and weigh in the next steps - how best to assess the recommendations, outline the process moving forward, and prioritize the work, use this as a foundation for our work this and in years to come. Need to determine how we are going to implement the strategies that get identified as priorities.
- Allison Breitenother provided a high-level overview of the structure. Asking ARWG: do we want to set up subgroups within the ARWG, possibly just a prioritization subgroup that meets in between meetings, what does the next year look like? Next three years?
 - Sectors: Water Resources; Working Lands & Natural Resources-Based Economies; Protecting Critical Infrastructure; Human Health; and Natural Resources & Ecosystems. Focus Areas: Justice, Equity, Diversity and Inclusion; Local Government Action & State Service Delivery; Climate Jobs & Training.
- *Discussion:*
 - MDP would be interested in talking through how to prioritize the recommendations moving forward. Experience facilitating the SWIP team - one challenge with a lot of recommendations to move forward, there are only so many people available to do work. Suggestion to set up a group that is focused on short-term action, and another on longer-term actions.
 - Important to establish leads - either agency or programs for the various strategies, when possible. **Q:** Did this go to the broader commission? Might be a viable way to get feedback on the prioritization piece and how to move it forward. **A:** No, the full report has not gone to the Commission yet. This is a great collection of recommendations from stakeholders and now it's ARWG's role to identify what is implementable and then sharing it with the Commission and other working groups. There needs to be due diligence by the working group before going to the full Commission.
 - MDOT: Appreciate the definitions at the beginning, particularly equity and EJ as it relates to this document. These definitions will help us move forward with the framework and strategies. Flooding keeps coming up as an issue - Coast Smart discussion around Repetitive Loss Properties. Having the definition for overburdened communities that have an intersection with the communities with high rates of RLPs may be a good intersection point for the ARWG to prioritize, look to the Critical Infrastructure sector.
 - For the prioritization - if we can get enough people to commit in each sector group to work on the prioritization. At some point, we need to think about what the legislative vehicle will be to implement the various strategies.
 - Suggestion to have briefing sessions with stakeholders around the state so they can weigh in on the priorities for implementation and understanding what would help them the most.
 - Looking for alignment with existing programs and policies. And look closely at local examples (Charles Co, Baltimore Urban Flood Team).
 - Cross-Framework priorities – trying to identify what are the next steps to looking holistically at this framework.
 - Suggestion to see where the alignment is with the other working group work plans and scopes.
 - With the new federal infrastructure document, might be a good place to start looking for the funding opportunities to support the work.
 - **Q:** Was there any analysis of how this Framework aligns with neighboring state's

plans?

- **Q:** Do you think there is an opportunity for ARWG to present to the legislature between now and next session? It would be great to have recommendations from the MCCC efforts incorporated into proposed bills. As an example, if we are looking to track our resilience at a State level, we could propose metrics that could support our trend data. The earlier comment about 'critical infrastructure' being defined at a county level is an example of data degradation that could occur.
 - Would be particularly beneficial outside of session. Discussion has occurred with the Commission about "white papers" and if not a briefing, might be able to work with ECO if members think it's a good idea.
 - Addressing this question will be included in the prioritization discussion.
- **Q:** When the state makes on-the-ground investment decisions for building, do they specifically identify adaptation timelines and local thresholds. Especially as we are thinking about areas that may be seeing increased nuisance flooding and will be dealing with sea-level rise? **A:** In terms of building and the use of state funding in areas subject to flooding/SLR, we have the Coast Smart Construction Program in place. This extends to the State agencies as well as the local jurisdictions now. Forecasting out to 2050 and 2100, I believe..Also.. the Critical Area Commission requires an analysis of vulnerability and a summary of resiliency measures in place and proposed.
- **Volunteers:** Matt Rowe, Jason Dubow, Brandy Espinola, Sandy Hertz, Jill Lemke
- Alignment with federal infrastructure bill.
- **Key Takeaway:** Will be getting a group together to start talking about the process, begin deciding how we will prioritize, and inform the work plan.

C. Advance Saltwater Intrusion Plan. *Lead: Jason Dubow*

- a. **Action:** ARWG members will hear the update and engage in discussion for identifying action steps towards advancing the two saltwater intrusion plan recommendations (Wetland migration strategies and development of a Wetland Adaptation Plan).
- b. **Materials:** PDF of the Dashboard Regarding Progress Implementing the Saltwater Plan for Distribution to the ARWG
- Slides provided with summary information. MDP is continuing to lead the Saltwater Intrusion State Agency Team for implementation. Team has a dashboard (pdf provided) to track progress, understanding who is lead, and identifying synergies to achieve the identified goals. Setting up a subgroup for the MCCC-ARWG Recommendation, focused on a wetland adaptation plan. Slides provide an overview of the Subgroup Draft Plan. Jason provided an overview of the dashboard progress status that was provided to attendees via email.
- **Key Takeaway:** Jason will continue to keep ARWG updated, if you have thoughts on implementation of the work plan or development - reach out to him directly.

D. Building Capacity to Compete for Natural Infrastructure Funds. *Lead: Christine Conn*

- a. **Action:** Identify strategies to capitalize on funding opportunities for Natural Infrastructure Funds. ARWG members are asked to come prepared to share agency or organizational updates relevant to this recommendation.
- Targeted Resiliency Areas - goal: develop comprehensive water quality and climate change resiliency portfolio. Idea of having the portfolios assembled (list of projects that create climate resiliency benefits), is to be ready and be nimble for new funding opportunities. Two pathways: 1) projects that have been solicited through Grants

Gateway that were not selected for funding. 2) focusing on geographic targets that can focus landscape and watershed wide resiliency benefits, and identify specific communities we can work with. Status update: multiple levels of analysis have resulted in 6 potential areas to work in across Western MD (Antietam Creek and Lower Monocacy) and Eastern Shore (Chester Choptank, Little Choptank, Transquaking-Nanticoke, Pocomoke). Once areas selected will be working with local governments and groups to narrow down where exactly the work will occur. Opening up for discussion to ARWG / question for the working group: interested in looking where are the opportunities to work with other state agency partners, effort is about collaboration and capacity building. And also how natural and nature based projects (green infrastructure) can work alongside gray infrastructure. Currently still in the review and selection process and will be looking for a contractor in the coming months.

- *NFWF*: working to align where states are putting their resources, to inform their prioritization as it informs the federal prioritization. Resiliency work is so placed based and requires a lot of work with the communities to see what they want to see and how they see it.
- *CBP* - Climate Resiliency Working Group just got funded through GIT to put together priority restoration areas for marsh restoration work. Will be working with stakeholders (like state agencies) to identify their priority areas and overlay it with marsh migration work and identify focal areas (one in MD and one in VA), that partner organizations can get together and work on.
- Suggestion to make connection with the ICPRB - Interstate commission on the Potomac River Commission. There is a drinking water subgroup looking at how to use natural and nature based features to protect drinking water supply.
 - We are using that ICPRB prioritization for the Upper Potomac Forest Buffer strategy too.
- **Key Takeaway:** Continue the discussion with all partners and efforts to reduce redundancies and put Maryland in the best position to be competitive for the funding opportunities.

E. Environmental Justice and Equity *Lead: Brandy Espinoza*

- a. **Action:** ARWG will receive an update on the MCCC Climate Justice Working Group and identify next steps and work plan actions to incorporate into ARWG's activities.
- Climate Justice Team – made up of representatives from the working groups and external stakeholders tasked with identifying how the Commission is addressing equity considerations in all the work. Team was formed in 2021 and identified necessary members, and what the work would look like, developed a mission statement, took training on cultural competency, and reviewed recommendations that came out of the working groups. Moving into 2022, the CJ team is looking to roll out DEIJ education for the Commission and working groups, having shared definitions and understandings of the topics is critical to all the collective work. CJ teams are working to schedule more regular check ins with the working group chairs to ensure better alignment with the CJ team. The CJ team will be reviewing the working group plans. Thinking through core climate justice topics that may or may not be covered by the working groups: housing and economic issues, heat alignment. Working to coordinate with ACCO and the possible integration with the Maryland Climate Leadership Academy.
 - **Q:** Conversation thread for this whole meeting – community interaction. How can we have things in place to bring the resources to the communities we know they need. As we look at grey infrastructure projects, where are the opportunities to have green infrastructure integrated from the very beginning. Are there ways to link to green/grey



infrastructure that will work.

- **Q:** How is the climate justice team aligned with the Commission on Environmental Justice and Sustainable Communities? **A:** Devon Dodson is running the CEJSC and he is participating with the CJ group, providing thought leadership as far as how to structure the new committee, and identifying the leg work that needs to be done on the front end and ensuring alignment with the group. Working to ensure the effort is supportive of and not duplicative of the CEJSC approach.
- **Q:** Has the CJ group talked about job training or opportunities as it relates to climate issues? **A:** New group, but yes the topic has been on the table.
 - Thinking about working with the Department of Corrections - bringing them into the workforce development discussions. And also aligning with criminal justice reform.
 - Forestry is looking at workforce development as part of the 5 million trees initiative as well.
- **Key Takeaway:** The climate justice group will continue to enhance coordination with the working groups and review ARWG's upcoming products.

V. Public Comment, Updates, & Next Steps

3:50 - 4:00

- Paul Berman: complimenting the drafters of the Framework Recommendations document because of the Land Acknowledgement inclusion. Hope that the values reflected there will be included in all of our work. Additionally, when talking about saltwater intrusion - ask to focus as well on saltwater intrusion on buildings, the shore, Ocean City and the potential insurance implications.
- Sandy Hertz: this April is the second annual Flood Awareness Month. Be on the lookout for webinars, engagement opportunities and facts - focus is flooding in tidal and non-tidal areas. Find information on the Maryland Resiliency Partnership [website](#).

Attendees:

(Members): Erik Meyers, Fredrika Moser, Brandy Espinola, Wade Hearle, Anne Hairston-Strang, Vanessa Calaban (proxy for Sara Bender), Tom Parham, Jason Dubow, Alicia Mulkey, Sandy Hertz, Catherine McCall, Alex Borkowski

(Non members):

Paul Berman, Greg Burks, Tim Lavallo, Scott Dance, Patrick DeArme, Spyros Papadimas, Alexandra DeWeese, Ari Engelberg, Bunky Luffman, Christine Conn, Dylan Taillie, Elliott Campbell, Jenn Raulin, Kate Vogel, Kate Charbonneau, Matt Fleming, Megan Granato, Nicole Carlozo, Lynn Faulkner, Josh Foster, Beth Groth, Theodore Henry, John Kuriawa, Katie May Laumann, Kate McClure, Kevin Antoszewski, Cindy Osorto, David Seaborn, Erick Thurnell, Jim George, Kevin Wagner, Kim Drake, Matt Rowe, Rachel Lamb, Joy Hatchette, Jill Lemke, Chuck Boyd, Debbie Herr-Cornwell, Nell Ziehl, Karen Metchis, Dave Nemazie, Robert Newton, Amanda Poskaitis, Julie Reichert-Nguyen, Jake Reilly, Taryn Sudol, Herb Wolff, Melanie Dickersbach, Melissa Slatnick, Mike Sheffer, Stephanie Heidbreder.

