

Notes from CCSP 5.3 General Meeting
December 11, 2006

Attendees: Nathan Mantua, Michael Dettinger, Thomas Pagano, Andy Wood, David Feldman, Jin Huang, Pedro Restrepo, Kathy Jacobs, Robin Webb, Brent Yarnal, Helen Ingram, Denise Fort, Gregg Garfin, Barbara Morehouse, Adrienne Antoine, Nancy Beller-Simms

- I. Introduction of CCSP members present

- II. FACA process – Nancy
 - A. Federal Advisory Committee Act
 1. 900-1000 committees in existence at any time, approximately 65,000 serve as members
 2. Purposes include: Enhance public accountability of advisory committees and reduce wasteful expenditures on Advisory Committees
 - B. Advisory committee
 1. “Any committee, board, commission, council, conference panel task force or other similar group which is established by statute or established or utilized by the President or by an agency official for the purpose of obtaining advice or recommendations”
 2. Federal advisory committees exist to advise and recommend – not to decide
 3. FACA was not intended to be a public participation statute
 - C. FACA Goals/Regulations
 1. Reduce undue influence of special interests
 2. Eliminate decisions behind closed doors
 3. Improve public confidence in decision-making
 4. Open government processes to public participation
 5. Contemporaneous public access
 - D. Requirements
 1. Minutes must be kept
 2. Any member of the public is permitted to file a written statement with the advisory committee
 3. Advisory committee members may be subject to ethics and conflict-of-interest statutes, regulations and other rules
 - E. Compensation
 1. Travel expenses paid
 2. No personal compensation
 - F. Subcommittees
 1. Are not subject to FACA requirements, as long as the work of such groups are properly characterized in public at the meeting of its parent or chartered committee
 2. The chartered committee cannot simply “rubber stamp” the work of the subcommittee
 3. Subcommittee can include any working group or other ad hoc or semi-permanent group

- G. More on CCSP 5.3 and the 21 S&A products
1. NOAA has responsibility for 7 of 21 S&A products (Synthesis and Assessment Products)
 2. All NOAA products are accomplished by the creation of a report that is reviewed by the NAS.
 3. The only completed S&A product is CCSP 1.1 (Temperature Trends in the Lower Atmosphere: Steps for Understanding and Reconciling Differences). It is available on the website (<http://www.climate-science.gov>) and is approximately 100-150 pages of text and pictures/graphs/charts
 4. CCSP Goal 5: "Explore the uses and identify the limits of evolving knowledge to manage risks and opportunities related to climate variability and change" includes
 - a. CCSP 5.1 Uses and limitations of observations, data, forecasts, and other projections in decision support for selected sectors and regions.
 - b. CCSP 5.2. Best practice approaches for characterizing, communicating, and incorporating scientific uncertainty in decision-making
 - c. CCSP 5.3 Decision support experiments and evaluations using seasonal to interannual forecasts and observational data
- H. CCSP 5.2 is presently being reviewed by the Academy - Nancy will send the draft document when it has been reviewed by the Academy (it was intended guide the other SAP products)
- I. CCSP 5.1 has enormous applications with ours
- a. How does CCSP 5.1 differ from ours?
 - CCSP 5.1 is not necessarily targeting water as much as we will be
 - b. Why we shouldn't overlap with CCSP 5.1?
 - It is more an inventory and not decision support focused. NASA is asking for consultants to write it.
- J. Timing for CCSP 5.3: Not really good
- a. Nancy: it is a political decision, not a decision that can be changed.
 - We need to have the word document by December 2007 and not the final printed copy in by that time
 - We may be able to do the public review and the CCSP review at the same time
 - b. Why did CCSP 1.1 take so long?
 - It's not the research or writing that took a long time, it was the FACA process they had to redo.
 - c. How should we handle the short timeline? -- Two ways to do this, One is to continue the struggle to buy some more time and the other is to try to see what can be accomplish by then. So we either adjust the time or the product
 - d. Why do some get another 6 months and we can't? (till 6/08)
 - The CCSP office sent the dates to Congress and we therefore cannot change it.
 - We shouldn't plan to miss the deadline. We should create benchmarks to reach the deadline and if we cannot make it, we will deal with it then

- III. Temporary Benchmarks to completion:
- Stakeholder meeting is January 8-10, 2007
 - Mid-April: all sections done
 - April 15th: Send draft to the Academy
 - The Academy gets a month for review
 - We get a month for revisions
 - Send it out to the public for a month for review
 - When it comes back to us there is another month for revisions
 - Then we send it to the agencies for review
- IV. Outline: A discussion of each section:
- A. Section 1: Description and evaluation of forecast products – Nate (Mike, Andy, Thomas)
1. Nate: A conference call was held in August where we discussed existing monitoring and forecasting products, and the time and space scales relative to those products, as well as, evaluations of the skill on a regional basis.
 2. Helen: There is a partial overlap between looking at the product and looking at the decision makers and the application, so if sectors means services then we see some overlap
 3. Nate: We feel like there will be a lot of overlap because of the convergence of the sectors and the geographic relationships
 4. Mike: Section 1 focuses more on the production of the climate products and the work the NRCS and NCEP do and produce, and Section 2 seems to be more about the users, how they use those products and if they are useful to them.
 5. Helen: This comment relates to how you need to engage the end-user earlier in product development and how there needs to be feedback from decision-makers and users. This could be brought up later in the report
 6. Andy: Maybe leave more sectoral information until Section II, but it begs the questions how do you talk about the topics in Section II without talking about sectors in Section I
- B. Section II Dave (Helen)
1. Dave: Section II met in August and discussed what sectors would need to be presented in the document. Things we need to look at include: the range of water related decisions, the forecasts needed by resource managers and how that information is relayed to them, what are the challenges forecasters and resource managers have, and how do we involve practitioners. Also, need to look at, reservoir management, irrigation management, ecosystem protection, natural resource management, infrastructure issues, other users of hydrology and climate information that are not as direct, coastal zone management, disaster preparedness management, etc. How is this information used by them as well and what are the challenges surrounding that. Also, we need to identify the indicators of progress.

2. Helen: It seems that sectors is much more complete in Section II and it is fine if we mention some of it in Section I.
 3. Robin: where does the private sector fit in? How do the universities, private sector, government, and such coordinate? We need to look at that in this situation and how to address and discuss that.
 4. Helen; We would definitely want to talk about that specifically in Section III. Are there some private sectors more relevant than others?
 5. What kind of water are we looking at? (fresh, salt, etc)
 - a. Nancy: It's not spelled out in the document so I think it is up to the committee to decide.
 - b. There is a premise that this kind of assessments are supposed to address everything
 - c. Robin: There is another group that will look at some coastal aspects. But when we are talking about seasonal to interannual forecasts I think we need to think about what aspects of coastal management should we look at and how infiltration of different types of water will affect that
 - d. Dave: A further reason that we need to address the interface of salt and fresh water is that our audience includes water managers that are concerned with those kind of interface issues. We need to do the work on the broad range of decisions water managers make which is something that hasn't really been done
- C. Section III (Helen): Analysis of present and past decisions.
1. Helen: This section will include options for improving data products, and new products. A challenge is for the authors of the other sections to keep us informed of what they are writing about. This section is going to be based on the topics presented in the previous sections.
 2. Denise: Agricultural use, the effect of the terrestrial warming and the changes in weather patterns and weather adaptation means that we will need to change how agriculture is done in the west and if we will reach a point where agriculture in the west may have to stop.
 3. Dave: Other challenges to address are the changing societal conditions and the users of information. For example if an area is going from rural to urban how does that change their needs and what sort of planning horizons need to be studied to help them change and prepare appropriately.
 4. Mike: If we do our job well in Sections I and II, some discussion in the difference in the urban and agricultural sectors and their needs and differing adaptation strategies will set the stage for this discussion.
 5. Mike: We cannot talk about variability and then jump into long-term terrestrial warming, the question for CCSP 5.3 specifically relates to seasonal to interannual forecasts. We need to just set the stage first so there can be a clear link so that when we do move on from variability to something like terrestrial warming there is a flow.
 6. Helen: Section III will ultimately be an intellectual exercise that will tie everything together and be an effort by everyone on the committee. The

section committee will prepare a draft, however, the other sections input will be very important

7. Robin: IPCC will be coming out with an extreme events table in February
8. Paleoclimate record and how that information is used to map out extended drought periods is also something we should discuss
9. Helen: It's not in the prospectus, but that doesn't mean we cannot discuss it. I think based on this discussion, it would be helpful
10. Dave: In Section III, given the fact that we now have all this uncertainty and other such issues, what sorts of challenges are there to create new networks in addressing new challenges?

V. January meeting:

- A. UCAR is helping us coordinate this meeting.
- B. We will meet at the Latham Hotel in Georgetown (closest airport is DCA, and then Dulles, last resort is BWI)
- C. 9am on the second day will be the opportunity for the public to comment
- D. Stakeholders: we should invite people who are not the usual suspects
- E. Helen: What do we want from the meeting? We want to walk away with a topical outline with writing assignments and some notions with the direction that we are going in so that we can attack Section III at the same time as I and II. We want to know what the bottom lines are so we can all be on the same page.
- F. Kathy: We need to tell the stakeholders what we want from them and we need to think about what we can get from them that we don't already have. There needs to be a well defined item that we can take away from the conversation which might not be that we want a framework for the report.
- G. Dave: it would be good if we could find people who are trying to use climate information for water resource management and what are the challenges they face.
- H. Greg: I think that we can eliminate the so-called usual suspects and maybe focus in on inviting folks from other regions that haven't been represented in the past. And in looking at Section III of the report, I would like to hear what has led to successful use of the information from the actual stakeholders, and in what regions is forecasting not providing stakeholders with information
- I. Denise: The Nature Conservancy has a strong program on aquatic systems and looks at climate and we should invite someone from there because it would be on a national level.
- J. Stakeholders: People who manage resources or people who use the information
- K. Nate: there are private sector companies who are trying to take climate information and customize it into particular products, such as applications for the energy sector. Someone like this could really provide some insightful information.
- L. One suggestion is for participation from a bottled water company. There are implications for tapping into springs.

- M. Most of these companies are tapping into underground water sources that aren't affected by climate as much.
- N. Need to be careful about the mix here, if we are only going to have 7 people and therefore we need to make sure we have people who are new and people who we usually connect with because they have experience in these types of venues.
- O. Helen: But with the usual people, we know what they are going to say, so including new people will be worthwhile.
- P. Some suggestions for stakeholders
 1. Robin: A Potomac River Basin representative would be good because they aren't in a RISA as we don't interact with them a lot.
 2. Terry Fulp from the Bureau of Reclamation is one suggested stakeholder
 3. The Army Corps of Engineers: Someone in Texas or Tucson
 4. Someone involved in everglades restoration, the Florida RISA may have a name
 5. Andy: As I read our section I overview, I see a lot of questions that could be answered from the climate forecast producer community and therefore having someone from CPC would be useful to find out why they choose certain products, models, etc. Suggestions include: Wayne Higgins, Arun Kumar.
 6. Nate: Waste and Wastewater disposal, think about storm water issues and wastewater. I think we need someone from there.
 7. The South Florida Water Management District covers the Everglades, Miami and other districts in Florida, which would cover both the Everglades and water management issues.
 8. Also, want to focus on energy more, NRDC does a lot of work out in the California Basin
 9. Nate: There is an agency that does policy work in the Columbia Basin that looks very closely at climate Information and managing tradeoffs in hydropower, ecosystem management and water use.

VI. Final Thoughts

- A. Think about stakeholders that you think would be useful for your sections and forward them to Nancy (Nancy.Beller-Simms@noaa.gov) and she and Helen will collaborate on a final list. Send them by noon EST, December 12th.
- B. Leaders should set up section meetings for after January before the holidays so that they are set.