

Using Ecosystem Services to Increase Progress Toward, and Quantify the Benefits of Multiple CBP Outcomes

Jeremy Hanson
Chesapeake Research Consortium
WQGIT Coordinator & Workshop Chair

Workshop objectives



Engage with stakeholders on effective application of new ecosystem services (ES) results into tools and decision making at multiple levels



Develop recommendations for an actionable work plan of how ecosystem services can be used to address multiple CBP outcomes.

Both short term (reaching 2025) and longer term (beyond 2025)

Day 1

March 16

Speakers and
Case Studies,
concluded with
listening session

Day 1.5

April 18

Added session to
fill some Day 1
gaps

Day 2

June 6

Bringing it all
together and
assessing
potential actions
from Days 1 & 1.5

Workshop Structure

Foundation has continued to grow w/in partnership

Context: Why now?

Appetite, need and opportunity are increasingly clear

Build on 2017 STAC workshop

McGee et al. 2017

Partnership has made some progress

e.g., Rossi et al. 2023

Partners exploring and making moves in these areas

See Day 1 speakers
Elliot Campbell &
Lisa Wainger

Current approach falls short

Reaching 2025 &
CESR reports

Water quality is not the salient incentive for most target audiences (implementers, landowners, etc.)

We are at a major pivot opportunity with partnership

Beyond 2025
Steering
Committee

“Make it easier”

“Ecosystem services can be the bridge between water quality and all the other outcomes we care about.”

“Making the case for ecosystem services is the next big economic driver for us in agriculture.”

Findings

...In the words of three different participants

Workshop recommendations

01 Develop a tool that quantifies ecosystem services currently being provided across the Chesapeake Bay Watershed.

CBPO should adopt an accounting framework and develop associated platform that quantifies priority ES at appropriate spatial scales across watershed.

- Engage stakeholders about decision support needs to identify preferred outputs
- Summaries of monetary values desirable, but other metrics needed to serve different goals

02 Build capacity to support the integration of ecosystem services throughout the Chesapeake Bay Program.

Build internal capacity with addition of staff dedicated to this issue and multi-outcome/cross-partnership support

- Develop communications toolbox with use cases, customizable materials/products, etc.
- “Train the trainers” and concierges; identify opportunities for targeted technical assistance

03 Develop a framework for quantifying the ecosystem service impacts of select BMPs.

Complete quantification of ES for subset of BMPs and explore how best to model the impacts using existing or new planning tool.

- Identify application ready or near-ready ES information
- Identify and develop approaches to model additional key relevant ES over long-term; build on related BMP planning products for non-model users

Workshop recommendations

04 Improve consideration of ecosystem services in land use planning and decision-making.

Bay Program partners (fed/state) and local gov'ts should identify opportunities to strengthen policies, incentives and crediting to improve consideration of ES

- Work with LLWG and LGAC where ES could be incorporated into local planning documents
- CBP should evaluate and develop ES crediting framework to complement existing WQ framework.

05 Improve consideration of ecosystem services in the funding and financing of Chesapeake Bay restoration activities.

Bay Program and funding/financing partners should embrace opportunities to improve internal funding decisions and leverage funding from emerging ES markets to accelerate conservation and implementation.

- Agency partners identify grants that could encourage multi-benefits; CBP convene with funders; convene SRFs and finance experts to explore creative opportunities


06 Identify and follow pathways to improve institutional structures and supporting policies to better integrate ecosystem services into the next phase of the Chesapeake Bay Program beyond 2025.

Building on this report, B25SC should explore how to incorporate and prioritize ES and multi-outcome synergies.

- This can be a conceptual bridge between WQ and other agreement outcomes, and can set up partners for longer term benefits.

A close-up photograph of a cluster of purple flowers, likely a species of thistle or similar, with many small, tubular florets. The background is a soft, out-of-focus green. The image is framed by a white border.

Conclusions

A photograph of a bee, possibly a bumblebee, perched on a purple flower. The bee is shown in profile, facing left. Its body is black and white, and its wings are partially spread. The background is a blurred green and purple.

Why we need ecosystem services: to help understand “the value of what we already have, what we might lose, and what we could gain, so that we can leverage every single dollar from every type of funding stream to get our projects paid for.” (excerpt from Anna Killius’ Day 1 talk)



Conclusions

Academic, state, federal and local partners are already exploring piecemeal innovative approaches to apply ES concepts

The Partnership has a unique opportunity to play an active role to leverage ES concepts at a watershed scale to achieve greater, more lasting progress toward multiple goals and outcomes that support healthy, vibrant and resilient watershed communities

THANK YOU!

Workshop Steering Committee:

Jeremy Hanson, CRC, Water Quality GIT Coordinator (Workshop Chair)

Ellen Gilinsky*, Ellen Gilinsky LLC.

Bo Williams, EPA CBPO

Scott Phillips, USGS, Co-Chair of Scientific, Technical Assessment, and Report (STAR) Team (Retired)

Emily Pindilli, USGS, Director of USGS Science and Decision Center

Ryann Rossi, (former) EPA ORISE, now FSU-PC, St. Andrew and St. Joseph Bays Estuary Program

Kristin Saunders, UMCES

Lisa Wainger, UMCES-CBL

Susan Yee, EPA ORD

Kaylyn Gootman, EPA CBPO

Katie Brownson, USDA Forest Service

Bill Jenkins, EPA Region 3

*STAC member

Acknowledgements

We wish to thank Sherry Witt, all our speakers and participants for their contributions to this workshop and to STAC and STAC Staff for making it possible.

References from slides

McGee, B., M. Bryer, J. Davis-Martin, L. Wainger, R. Batiuk, J. Greiner, S. Newbold, K. Saunders, S. Phillips, and R. Dixon. 2017. Quantifying Ecosystem Services and Co-Benefits of Nutrient and Sediment Pollutant Reducing BMPs. Edgewater, MD.
http://www.chesapeake.org/pubs/381_McGee2017.pdf

Rossi, R.E., C. Bisland, B. Jenkins, V. Van Note, B. Williams, E. Trentacoste, Susan Yee. 2023. Quantifying Ecosystem Services Benefits of Restoration and Conservation Best Management Practices in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development, Washington, DC. EPA/600/R-22/170.
https://cfpub.epa.gov/si/si_public_record_report.cfm?dirEntryId=357757