

AGENDA
Climate Change Adaptation Workgroup
of the
Advisory Committee on Water Information
October 12, 2012; 1:00 – 2:30
Call in Number: 1-855-547-8255 (toll free)
Access code: 60862

- I) **Introductions and Agenda Review**
- II) **Workgroup Charter and Purpose**
 - Review Charter (see attached)
 - Links to Other ACWI elements
 - Coordination with Related Climate Programs and Projects
- III) **Workgroup Membership/Organization**
 - Workgroup Member List (see attached)
 - Workgroup Co-Chairs
 - Interest in Subcommittees
 - Interest in a General Briefing for Members on Water and Climate Topics
- IV) **Workplan for 2013**
 - Discussion of Priorities
 - Subcommittee Assignments
 - 2012 Workplan for *National Action Plan: Priorities for Managing Freshwater Resources in a Changing Climate* (see 2012 Workplan attached and *Plan* at http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/ceq/2011_national_action_plan.pdf)
- V) **Reports on Key Federal Activities: Climate and Water**
 - Extreme Weather Workshops; Karen Metchis; EPA
 - COMET Training; TBD
 - Water Chapter; National Climate Assessment; Jared Bales; USGS
- VI) **Reports on Non-Federal Activities: Climate and Water**

Workgroup members that would like to give a brief summary of an activity or project of interest to the Workgroup should reply to the invitation email with suggested topics
- VII) **Adjourn**

**Climate Change Adaptation Workgroup
of the
Advisory Committee on Water Information
October 12, 2012; 1:00 – 2:30
Meeting Minutes**

Attendees:

Adam Carpenter, AWWA
Aris Georgakakos, NIWR
Ben Chou, NRDC
Brandon Kernen, ASDWA
Brenda Hoppe, Oregon Health Authority
Chris Carlson, USDA-USFS
Craig Zamuda, DOE
Dave Carlton, ASFPM
Diana Bowen, Coastal States Organization
Dick Engberg, AWRA
Elana Goldstein
Ernie Wells, NOAA-NWS
Fay Augustyn, American Rivers
Jeff Manning, ACWA
Jeff Peterson, EPA
Jerad Bales, DOI-USGS
John Schmerfeld, DOI-FWS
Judy Francis, NACP

Karen Metchis, EPA
Levi Brekke, DOI-BOR
Marjorie McGuirk, NOAA-NWS
Mary Musick, GWPC
Michael Block, NGWA
Mike Muse, EPA
Nancy Jane Andrews, CEQ
Nancy Turyk, NALMS
Natalie Roy, Clean Water Network
Noel Gollehon, USDA-NRCS
Paul Freedman, WEF
Paul Wiegand, NCASI
Peg Bostwick, ASWM
Peter Ruffier, NACWA
Regina Lyons, EPA
Richard Raione, USNRC
Steve Wolff, ICWP
Tom Nicholson, USNRC
Wendy Norton, DOI-USGS

Action Items:

- **ACTION:** *Wendy Norton* will set up a poll within the next couple of days, so **Jeff and Paul can choose a date and begin to develop an agenda.** Who else is interested in participating in meeting development? Wendy will assist. Others should contact Jeff or Paul or Wendy.
- **ACTION – ALL:** **Let us know if there are any days that are particularly bad for scheduling a face-to-face meeting (i.e., large conference already scheduled).**
- **ACTION:** **The co-chairs will confer and get back to the group with options soon.**

Introductions and Agenda Review:

This agenda includes review of charter, work plan development, interest in subcommittees, information sharing by Federal organizations and non-Federal organizations on their climate-related activities are welcome.

Jeff Peterson introduced himself and noted the contents of the Terms of Reference, including procedures and operations for the workgroup. Most meetings will be virtual, by teleconference, but we're hoping to have at least one in-person meeting each year. We hope to make decisions by

consensus but will hold a vote if necessary; rules and procedures for this are outlined in the Terms of Reference. This workgroup is authorized to create subordinate teams to focus on specific issues, and we already have some ideas about the teams that may be needed in the short term.

Comment – The Nuclear Regulatory Commission is very interested in climate issues, so the more info you can provide in the way of information, the happier we'll be. We would like to be listed as an observer for this group, even though we're not a member.

Workgroup Charter and Purpose:

Question – how often does this workgroup report to ACWI, and in what venue? *Answer* – Annual reports to ACWI are required, but the group could report more frequently, if needed.

Question – I appreciate the clarity provided with respect to decision making, but when I look at the functions listed in the TOR, I don't see a lot of items that would require that much decision making. What are some examples? *Answer* – that's something we can determine as we move forward. There are opportunities to make recommendations to ACWI, but we expect that most of these will be reached by consensus. The procedures related to decision making are established just to cover the bases in case disagreement arises within the group.

Jeff Peterson noted that ACWI's Subcommittee on Hydrology has great interest in climate information, as does the Sustainable Water Resources Roundtable and other ACWI subcommittees. We should be on the lookout for any opportunities to coordinate with the other ACWI subgroups. If anyone on this call belongs to another ACWI subgroup, please mention this group to them, and tell them that they are welcome to participate and we're happy to work with them.

Comment – some people on this workgroup also serve on ACWI's Subcommittee on Ground Water, which is very interested in trying to marry their activities with those of this Climate Workgroup.

Related coordination groups include Interagency Task Force on Climate Change Adaptation, OSTP/NOAA (a key product is National Action Plan, which recommended creation of this ACWI group); Fish, Wildlife, and Plants Strategy for Climate Adaptation; National Ocean Policy is developing an implementation plan, in which one of the nine key elements focuses on climate change as it relates to ocean and coastal environments and the interface between fresh and estuarine resources. There is also a Federal agency water workgroup that worked on the National Action Plan, and some of the people who worked on that group are part of this ACWI subgroup also. It will be important for us to coordinate with all these efforts.

Comment – one thing the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is interested in is for you guys to help us figure out potential climate change impacts that might be important to the nuclear power industry. We need to think of the ecological effects of withdrawing large amounts of water from the natural systems to help cool nuclear facilities. How would you address this type of question? *Response* – that's obviously an important consideration, and this group would be key in helping to bring issues like that to the attention of various Federal agencies that have purview for this type of issue; we need to bring the pertinent information to them.

Comment – regarding Delaware River Basin Commission, I'm the alternate for that organization, so they are involved in this group too. Drought Mitigation Center at University of Nebraska puts out the drought monitor and could be very valuable to this group.

Workgroup Membership/Organization:

Review of membership list and co-chair positions. Peterson is the Federal co-chair, and we'll also have a non-Federal co-chair. The non-Federal co-chair will be Paul Freedman, representing the Water Environment Federation.

We're hoping to fill in the empty slots quickly, so if you know somebody who is in one of the groups for which we don't yet have a rep, please contact them and send the information to Jeff and Wendy. Also, if the organization you represent has an alternate and haven't named them yet, send that info to Jeff and Wendy too.

There is an opportunity for this group to create subcommittees, so we should keep that in mind as we talk about issues that we might want to get involved in.

Many of you have a lot of time and experience in water issues, but others may not be as up-to-date on the issues we're discussing, and there's interested among the group members in getting a background briefing; thus, we're proposing to perhaps have a face-to-face meeting in the Washington, D.C., area in January or February 2013 to provide the type of background briefings that would be more difficult to deliver via conference call. This would also allow people to establish relationships and exchange ideas in a way that's not possible over the phone. ACWI has some limited resources to pay for travel for non-Federal members of this workgroup, so the travel expenses of some members would be covered for a face-to-face meeting.

What is everyone's reaction to the idea of an in-person meeting in January or February?

- NCASI is fully supportive of that idea and would appreciate the chance to become acquainted with the breadth of climate work that Federal and non-Federal organizations are undertaking.
- NACP seconds the suggestion; at this point in the workgroup's lifespan, it would be very useful to have a face-to-face meeting; the meeting could include a brief overview of water-climate programs, and perhaps that information could be compiled and circulated to the whole group, either in advance of the meeting or afterward.
- We could do a pre-meeting survey to help figure out what people would like to see covered at a meeting, and also to get some background on the various member organizations' activities in the climate arena.
- It may be useful to begin to compile a list of organizations that have ongoing climate-water activities underway, and then have a 15-20 minute webinar presentation at each conference call, to begin the education process.
- That's a good suggestion; if we try to pack the whole educational process into one meeting, we won't have time for any discussion or decision making.
- There are a lot of groups out there working the same issues, so we should leverage products that have already been developed (such as the CEQ work) as we try to pull the various story-lines together; we also need to define what we want to include (scope) as we cast our net – are we talking about the supply side, the user side, or some other aspect of the equation?

Reminder – The ACWI website is available for posting information. Send materials to Wendy Norton, and she will make sure they get put online.

We need a Doodle poll ASAP to determine the best date for a face-to-face meeting. **ACTION: Wendy Norton will set up a poll within the next couple of days, so Jeff and Paul can choose a date and begin to develop an agenda.** Who else is interested in participating in meeting development? Wendy will assist. Others should contact Jeff or Paul or Wendy. **ACTION – ALL: Let us know if there are any days that are particularly bad for people (i.e., large conference already scheduled).** Big interagency workshop is already scheduled for January 29-31, so please avoid that.

Comment – The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission interfaces with Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission, and this might be a good topic for briefing and/or discussion (i.e., impacts of climate change on Lake Ontario, where the two countries have nuclear facilities on north and south shore).

Work plan for 2013:

We included the 2012 National Action Plan work plan as part of the materials that we emailed prior to this meeting. I wanted people to be aware of what the plan focuses on (primarily Federal agencies). As we go forward, this workgroup can help develop a work plan for 2013 that focuses on key actions for climate change and water and includes not just Federal agencies, but critical topics across all levels of government and private/academic sectors. Each of the teams identified in the 2012 work plan is doing good work; as we go forward to 2013, the Federal agencies will be updating their portions of the work plan, and one of the things this group can help with is to assist in deciding whether data vulnerability and water efficiency are the right topics to focus on, and whether there are key tasks within those areas that aren't getting enough attention. If we have a face-to-face meeting in Jan/Feb, it would be helpful to have a draft 2013 work plan ready for review by then. We may want a subcommittee to deal with this issue.

Comment – out of the assessments that have been done, what kinds of information needs have we identified? For example, what will happen to aquifers in terms of recharge? The research priorities that have been identified as part of the National Climate Assessment should be considered as well. We may want to have a presentation in Jan/Feb on this, in addition to what Jerad Bales is going to present today.

- Strongly concur; that would be a strong basis for informing anything we do.
- Even in Wisconsin, we're experiencing issues with lakes and streams drying up; we have no basis for deciding how to address these issues that are new to us, but which the western States are already familiar with; so water quantity issues are a point of emphasis.
- Support having a draft work plan that could be distributed prior to the Jan/Feb meeting.

Question – There are several items in the 2012 plan that have an “ongoing” status; I assume those items would continue in the 2013 plan? *Answer* – yes, they would.

Reports on Key Federal Activities:

Extreme weather workshops (Karen Metchis, EPA) – working with a set of partners, including NOAA, dealing largely with water utilities sector to convene a workshop to explore what information the utilities need. We decided to convene a series of workshops (have conducted three and have two more to go) to address issues related to drought, flood, other issues developed jointly with local managers and decision makers in each workshop location. Santa Rosa, CA (Sonoma County); Gwynnett County, GA (ACF basin); Tidewater, VA (Chesapeake); Austin, TX (Region K of Lower CO River); Missouri River Basin, Kansas City area. We are now working on 2-page fact sheets describing case studies. Then we'll have briefings to transmit the findings. Already we've had some good (some unintended) outcomes from

these case studies, including networking among people who previously didn't realize that their organizations could benefit from talking to each other.

- *Question* – are these focusing on groundwater, or just on surface water? *Answer* – we look at both, depending on the particular issue we're examining.
- *Question* – During the public meetings, was the question of conceptual model parameter and scenario uncertainty ever brought up? *Answer* – yes, the issue of uncertainty about predicting conditions is front and center for all of these studies, and people need help understanding what the trends are in view of the fact that there's a lot of variability in the projections; a lot of it has to do with designing systems that are flexible/adaptable, and having good human response systems in place too; all of that has to be part of the conversation.

COMET training (Levi Brekke) – this activity is about training resources oriented toward weather practitioners who are tasked with dealing with climate change issues for the systems they manage. The pilot is being sponsored by a collective of organizations (BOR, COE, NOAA, EPA, NASA, USGS, UCAR). COMET has more than 20 years experience working with NWS' forecasting office. This fall we expect to release a learning module that can be taken for free online, training technically oriented studies on impact modeling. In January and March we're doing two pilot workshops. We have a diverse community of subject matter experts who helped to establish learning objectives, module content, etc.; we also use these experts to help with instruction. Beyond the pilot phase, we hope to develop water-quality-oriented and ecosystem-oriented materials.

- *Question* – one of the online modules is available; is the second one available? *Answer* – we didn't pay for the current online modules, but we're leveraging them and are pointing to them; ours will be released later this fall.

Water Chapter of National Climate Assessment (Jerad Bales) – The National Climate Assessment (NCA) contains a number of chapters which are informed by USGCRP technical input documents. USGS and COE put together Federal perspectives for the NCA water chapter; that document is more extensive, but it will be distilled to 8-10 pages for the NCA report. You may be familiar with USGS Circular 1330; we plan to publish our technical input document as a USGS circular, similar to Circular 1330; this document is currently in editorial review, then it will undergo USGS technical review prior to publication.

- *Question* – are you still thinking early December is the timeframe for release of the assessment as a whole? *Answer* – no, we won't be able to finalize it by then because it will need to undergo extensive review by numerous Federal agencies; the final document will probably be released toward the end of 2013. This document (especially the regional chapter) will be very interesting, but the supporting documents are even more useful, and this group needs to take a look at them. We can make these materials available to everybody in the group, eventually.

Reports on Non-Federal Activities: Climate and Water:

We're out of time, and the last agenda item was to give everyone on the group a chance to say something (if they wished) about projects their organizations may be involved in. I didn't get any requests from anyone who said they wanted to do that, but I'll ask now if anyone has anything to report.

From Department of Energy – we've had a series of GAO reports looking at energy/water nexus and making recommendations about unfinished work that needs to be completed. This fall we're having workshops within DOE to discuss efforts underway and establish a better roadmap for the future; we would like, next calendar year, to open those conversations to non-DOE groups. That's a good opportunity for collaboration with others who are working with climate-related issues in the water-energy arena.

From Association of State Wetland Managers – The Association of State Wetland Managers is working with the Association of State Floodplain Managers and others to pull together information across association boundaries related to climate, wetland, and other issues of interest to this group.

From U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission – we're having an SOH meeting this coming Monday, and it would be great if we could have you or Paul or somebody give a quick intro to this group over the phone, and describe what this group is all about. *Peterson* – I'd like to try to do that; please send me an email about the meeting.

Question – When will the next meeting be? *Answer* – **ACTION: The co-chairs will confer and get back to the group with options soon.**