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# Welcome

# Taking stock: What’s already working well?

# Chesapeake Bay Program

# Communications Office is putting together Communications Packets for several relevant topics. We currently have 8 in various stages:

# General Info, Conowingo, New Model, BMPs, Climate Change, Accounting for Growth, Planning Targets, and Local Area Goals

# These packets include talking points, a powerpoint that can be adapted, fact sheets, FAQs, video or photos, and social media posts

# We started on these last winter/spring. We were asked to put these on hold while the Midpoint Assessment was happening but are now picking them up again.

# The model packet is 100% complete and we can send it out to the group.

# Accounting for growth, general WIP info and Conowingo are the next closest to completion. These could be finalized in the next week or two.

# Our goal is to have them all complete and ready to be sent out prior to the holidays.

# These are all meant to be customizable, so partners can use and adapt them however would work best for them.

# We will be putting together 1-2 pagers about the various efforts the jurisdictions presented at the PSC meeting.

# We have a general fact sheet about the whole WIP planning process, which was sent out to media outlets about a year ago and will be updated soon. We will include a link to the current fact sheet, which is up on our website, along with the model packet.

# There is also a general powerpoint on cobenefits, which PA has used and found very useful. Rachel will share that as well.

# Cobenefit background: the Bay Program made 12 fact sheets for selected outcomes that show how WIP efforts could also provide benefits for these outcomes. The powerpoint brings all of that info together.

# Local Government Engagement Initiative (LGEI)

# Materials were created under the Local Government Engagement Initiative (LGEI), which LGAC was involved with.

# Work began around 2 years ago and was geared towards helping jurisdictions interact and engage with local governments around the WIP planning process.

# They created a spreadsheet that Mary will share: it identifies different milestone activities that may have some relevance with respect to communication and engagement with local governments (for example, release of new monitoring info or completion of midpoint assessment). It walks through process of understanding whether the milestone requires communication or engagement with local governments. It also went into more detail with identifying a specific audience: elected officials, staff, etc. If it would be helpful, they could create a webinar around that.

# They also drafted a memo to the Chesapeake Bay Program, which will be shared after the meeting. The memo lists jurisdictional needs and mentions what the Bay Program has already done.

# Q: Could you provide an example of an actionable case study? Mary will follow up with that.

# Draft Jurisdictional Needs: this document provides the detailed info behind the memo. If anyone has questions about this, please contact Mary before the end of the year.

# WIP Schedule Infographic: this infographic is entirely editable. There have been several versions—this is the most up to date. Mary can help you edit if needed.

# Fact sheet: this is also editable. Maryland used and edited one of the pages to be a full-page letter from Sec. Grumbles.

# Local Leadership Workgroup

# The team is working on a variety of aspects on WIP development, but it’s unclear what role the workgroup will play in development—they will definitely play a role in implementation. Their outcome is broader than the WIP, but the WIP is a part.

# The Alliance has a grant to develop curriculum for watershed education. This includes NFWF funding for two bus trips to take local elected officials from upstream to the Bay, and from the Bay to upstream areas of the watershed.

# They are hoping to create a watershed 101 video.

# We could potentially have a joint local leadership workgroup/communications workgroup meeting in the future—maybe next summer.

# Choose Clean Water Coalition

# CCWC worked with leads in each state to develop state-specific fact sheets about citizen’s engagement in the WIP planning

# The fact sheets describe where the states are, where they’re lagging and what members can do to work on the WIPs.

# CCWC members are the audience for these.

# They are now creating an index to put at the back of all of these fact sheets to define some of the jargon and help make the process clearer.

# CCWC will also be developing one pagers for each state out of these more comprehensive fact sheets.

# Municipal Online Stormwater Training (MOST)

# CCWC, MOST and Maryland League of Conservation Voters have collaborated on MOST’s stormwater success stories. They have a website dedicated to collecting case studies, including info on different projects, funding sources and fact sheets.

# Deb is working on a spreadsheet to identify what each state is doing so far and hopes to have this ready by the next call.

# Identifying Gaps: Communications Needs and Would-Love-To-Haves

# Kathy Stecker: Maryland is looking more towards implementation than WIP development. When meeting with the counties, several expressed interest in being able to show folks local progress on a website – maybe some kind of dashboard.

# Mary supports this – anything that can improve communications with local governments about progress would be great.

# CBP: Emily Trentacoste, who works at CBP, is currently working on a dashboard that contains tools/modules where local planners and WIP developers can look at county/jurisdiction/various area levels and see estimated loads, potential BMPs, etc. This is meant to be much more user friendly than CAST and easier to understand. It can be used as a pre-cursor to CAST, since CAST requires knowing what scenarios you want to run to reduce pollution loads, whereas this will help jurisdictions decide which scenarios might work for them. It doesn’t necessarily show progress but will be a tool local governments can use. It might be good to invite Emily to present at a future meeting.

# Deb has created the outline for a story map for the PA section of the watershed to track and share progress stories. She will share with the group – it’s not for broader distribution at this time. PA is hoping this can be a great way to combine compelling story telling with the local data. There is definitely interest in seeing progress at the local level – in particular, how much has already been reduced and how much is left?

# Gina: do counties want progress in terms of just nutrients and sediments, or what that means in terms of the broader picture (natural resources, fisheries, habitat, etc.)? It could be helpful to make the link between the numbers and the impacts that they can relate to more. This relates to the cobenefits of these WIP efforts.

# Creating this kind of dashboard for the watershed would be a huge lift, time and effort-wise.

# Wrap Up

**Next meeting:** Week of November 12 – look for a scheduler!