

**Engaging Local Governments**  
**As of August 22, 2016**

**Section 1: FUNDING RESOURCES**

**Much of EPA's support for local engagement in the Chesapeake Bay restoration efforts have been directed through grant funding:**

- **Through NFWF** – EPA funds two programs targeted to locals and currently administered, and leveraged, by the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF)
  - Small Watershed Grants (SWG) – these are smaller grants that help fund projects to meet objectives of the Chesapeake Bay Agreements
  - Innovative Nutrient and Sediment Reduction (INSR) Grants – These are larger grants targeted to finding innovative solutions to help reduce nutrients and sediment pollution in the Chesapeake Bay watershed
  - Between 2008 and 2016, EPA has provided roughly \$45 million dollars to local governments and non-governmental organizations, with almost \$15 million, going directly to local governments for specifically needed technical assistance expertise, and for implementation and restoration projects.
  - From 2000 to 2016, outcomes of these projects included
    - 2.8 million square feet of rain gardens and bio retention installed
    - 1.7 million square feet of impervious surfaces removed
    - 13,946 acres with improved storm water management
    - 6,612 acres of wetlands restored
    - 1,695 miles of riparian forest restored
  - Total EPA funding provided to NFWF for these programs 1999-2016 is \$115,545,300, and the projects funded, if not directly to a local government or organization have collateral benefit to them
  - These programs also pay to host annual networking forums directed at bringing together local stormwater practitioners (largely from municipalities), ag communities of practice, and the entire community local watershed groups at the Chesapeake Watershed Forum
- **Through EPA's state implementation grants (see below for more detail on projects by jurisdiction)** – more detail provided below.
  - \$5 million dollars in both FY14 and FY15, and another \$5M in FY2016, totaling \$15M made available to date
  - For local entities to reduce nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment loads to the Chesapeake Bay, consistent with the jurisdictions' WIPs
    - Direct implementation of nutrient and sediment reductions
    - Expansion of their regulatory and accountability capabilities
    - Training requested by local entities
- **To the Environmental Finance Center**
  - \$1,025,000 from EPA CBPO from FY2012-FY2016, for specific efforts to support local engagement
  - For strategies to finance storm water and resiliency
    - PA: in Wrightsville Borough, Mercersburg Borough, City of Scranton, City of York, Blair County and Lancaster County,
    - NY: in Tompkins County
    - MD: in Oxford, Federalsburg, Eastern Shore, City of Havre de Grace, Town of Easton, City of Cambridge, Prince George's County, and Annapolis/Narragansett (resiliency), and
    - VA: in Shenandoah Valley, City of Hampton
    - DE: Towns of Bethel and Laurel
  - Related to Agriculture

- Manure to Energy – Improving financial evaluation of each of the 5 on-farm pilot demonstration projects as part of a larger project with multiple funders
    - Assessing the effectiveness of a new BMP evaluation tool in Pocomoke watershed MD
  - Relate to innovative financing and capital work, including
    - Public-private partnership in Hampton, VA
    - Stormwater Banks in Baltimore, MD
    - Watershed Implementation Plan Financing Forums
  - Working with NFWF to support the Local Capacity Building Initiative projects in 2013 that funded two areas of work:
    - Showcase projects that were pulled together by the circuit rider team
    - Expanded technical assistance walk-up grant program for local governments
    - Case studies in PA, MD, DE, and VA
  - Related to advancing local-level water quality and resiliency financing
- **Implementation Grant funding for Local Implementation of WIPs (Funded activities are summarized below in Section 2.) - FY 2014 FY 2015 Base and Local funding levels**

Jurisdiction		FY 2014		FY 2015	
		CBIG	CBRAP	CBIG	CBRAP
DC	<i>annual funding</i>	\$1,250,000	\$723,036	\$1,250,000	\$723,036
	<i>local funding</i>	\$322,784		\$322,784	
DE	<i>annual funding</i>	\$1,250,000	\$820,465	\$1,250,000	\$820,465
	<i>local funding</i>	\$366,000		\$366,000	
MD	<i>annual funding</i>	\$2,515,700	\$2,758,047	\$2,515,700	\$2,758,047
	<i>local funding</i>	\$615,635	\$615,635	\$615,635	\$615,635
NY	<i>annual funding</i>	\$1,250,000	\$1,007,224	\$1,250,000	\$1,007,224
	<i>local funding</i>	\$449,654		\$449,654	
PA	<i>annual funding</i>	\$2,515,700	\$2,666,819	\$2,515,700	\$2,666,819
	<i>local funding</i>	\$1,190,544		\$1,190,544	
VA	<i>annual funding</i>	\$2,515,700	\$2,552,098	\$2,515,700	\$2,552,098
	<i>local funding</i>	\$750,000	\$389,329	\$1,139,329	
WV	<i>annual funding</i>	\$1,250,000	\$672,311	\$1,250,000	\$672,311
	<i>local funding</i>	\$300,139		\$300,139	

FY 2014	CBIG, annual	\$12,547,100
	CBIG, local	\$3,994,756
	<i>total =</i>	\$16,541,856

FY 2015	CBIG, annual	\$12,547,100
	CBIG, local	\$4,384,085
	<i>total =</i>	\$16,931,185

FY 2014	CBRAP, annual	\$11,200,000
	CBRAP, local	\$1,004,964
	<i>total =</i>	\$12,204,964

FY 2015	CBRAP, annual	\$11,200,000
	CBRAP, local	\$615,635
	<i>total =</i>	\$11,815,635

## **Section 2: FACILITATION AND COLLABORATIVE AGREEMENTS**

### **Seeking input and feedback from local citizens, via the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)**

- CAC members meet quarterly to learn about Chesapeake Bay initiatives and provide informed advice/recommendations to the Executive Council

### **Seeking input and feedback from local elected officials, via the Local Government Advisory Committee (LGAC)**

- LGAC members meet quarterly to learn about CBP initiatives; information is shared through their contacts and networks
- LGAC hosts local government forums (paid for in large part through the EPA's INSR and SWG programs which are run by NFWF, and by EPA grants to the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay) to address issues affecting local government's ability to implement programs to protect and restore the watershed
  - 2013 focus was leadership and communication; 2014 focus was monitoring; 2015 was local government/farmer collaboration; and 2016 will focus on integrated infrastructure planning and programming (funded in part by NFWF) and engaging local governments in MPA/Phase III WIPs

### **Chesapeake Watershed Agreement 2014**

- CBP is developing and will be implementing the **Local Leadership Management Strategy** called for by the 2014 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement
- The Management Strategy includes four approaches to increase the knowledge and capacity of local officials on issues related to water resources and in the implementation of economic and policy incentives that will support local conservation actions:
  - Develop, enhance and expand training and leadership programs
  - Increase peer to peer knowledge transfer for local officials
  - Improve transfer of knowledge to locals
  - Identify and improve key knowledge and information sources

### **Engaging local leaders in the development of the Phase III WIPs**

- Phase III WIP Stakeholder Assessment
  - EPA has funded a stakeholder assessment in preparation for the Phase III WIPs that is intended to recommend improvements to the WIP development, evaluation, implementation and oversight processes
  - Over 100 conversations have been held with the Bay watershed jurisdictions, the major federal facilities in the watershed, EPA, at least one conservation district from each of the Bay states; at least 14 local government representatives in each jurisdiction, NGOs (such as the Bay Foundation and Riverkeepers), and our Advisory Committees; conversations will help determine lessons learned from Phase 1/Phase II and gather initial thoughts on expectations for Phase III
  - **A focus of these discussions with our Bay partners is how local area targets could be expressed in Phase III** (e.g. BMP implementation rates; load reductions; programmatic targets).
  - An action plan is currently being developed that will recommend how the Phase III WIP stakeholder assessment findings can be used to inform the decision making by the CBP partnership on the development of the Phase III WIP expectations. For example, how can these Stakeholder Assessment findings be used to support engagement with localities in 2016/2017, in preparation of Phase III WIP development?
  - The action plan will be a living document, intended to capture feedback from the partnership and other stakeholder groups on expectations for the Phase III WIPs through the 2016, early 2017 timeframe.
- **Implementation Grant funding for Local Implementation of WIPs (Funding amounts summarized above in Section 1.)** – The following are the types of local activities the jurisdictions have supported with these funds (list not exhaustive)

#### District of Columbia

- River Smart Raingardens and other implementation projects
- Rain Barrel installation
- Green Roof Rebates

- Environmental Education

#### Maryland Implementation Grant

- Mostly to Counties
  - Restore stream channels
  - Septic system database and tracking
- Chesapeake Bay Trust
  - Outreach and Training
  - Planning
  - Project Design

#### Maryland Regulatory and Accountability

- To various counties
- Neighborhood scale stormwater restoration and retrofit programs
- In Frederick County, those homes participating get 60% reduction of stormwater utility fee
- Design phase stormwater retrofit
- Stream restoration
- Converting Bay TMDL Waste Load allocations to county local TMDL loads and map BMP opportunities

#### Virginia

- Soil and Water Conservation Districts to increase cost share for stream exclusion practice
- Localities for historic BMP data clean-up

#### West Virginia

- Training for engineers, maintenance, and field staff on newest regulations and technology of stormwater management
- Cost share for Conservation Districts willing to plant early cover crops
- Develop litter transfer program
- Develop porous pavement demonstration

#### New York

- Went to Upper Susquehanna Coalition
- Outreach, education, project planning, data collection and support

#### Delaware

- Green Infrastructure retrofit
- Restoration Project enhancements
- Denitrification bioreactor
- Small community water quality improvement program
- Ditch stabilization
- Bio-retention facilities

#### Pennsylvania

- Competitive award program to local governments for urban stormwater BMPs
- MS4 permittees must demonstrate:
  - Significant nutrient and sediment reductions
  - Work can be completed in project funding period
  - Project will be maintained