

Quarterly Progress Meeting: Diversity

Step 1: Summarize your outcome.

Outcome:

Diversity Outcome Identify minority stakeholder groups that are not currently represented in the leadership, decision making and implementation of conservation and restoration activities, and create meaningful opportunities and programs to recruit and engage them in the partnership's efforts.

Lead and Supporting Goal Implementation Teams (GITs): Fostering Chesapeake Stewardship GIT 5

Steering committee members: Maryland-Department of Natural Resources, Environmental Protection Agency, Choose Clean Water Coalition, Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay

Participating Partners:

State Agencies

Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control

Maryland Department of Natural Resources

Maryland Department of the Environment

Pennsylvania Department of Conservation and Natural Resources

Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation

Washington D.C. Department of Energy and Environment

Federal Agencies

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

U.S. Forest Service

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services

U.S. Department of Homeland Security

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association

National Parks Service

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Local Government

Annapolis Parks and Recreation
Anne Arundel County Public Schools
Capital Region Water
City of Annapolis
Fairfax County, Virginia, Board of Supervisors
Prince George's County Department of the Environment

Non-profit

Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay
Anacostia Watershed Society
AfroOutdoor
Baltimore National Aquarium
Blue Water Baltimore
Citizens Advisory Committee
Choose Clean Water Coalition
EcoLatinos
Environmental Professionals of Color – DC
Greater Baltimore Wilderness Coalition
GRID Alternatives
Groundwork Anacostia River DC
Interfaith Partners for the Chesapeake
Latin American Youth Center – DC
Lilileaf Solutions
Living Classrooms
Maryland League of Conservation
Mt. Olive AME Church, Annapolis, MD
National Aquarium
NSPIRE Green
Parks and People
PennFuture
People for Change
Re-Entry Saving the Anacostia (RESA)
Southeast CARE Coalition
Tree Baltimore
Virginia Conservation Network
WE ACT

University/college institutions

Coppin State University
Chesapeake College

University of Maryland, School of
Public Health
Virginia State University
Bowie State University
Norfolk State University
Hampton University
Morgan State University
Lincoln University

Progress:

Step 2: Explain the logic behind your work toward an Outcome.

The attached logic table (available as an Excel spreadsheet) explains the reasoning behind our work toward an Outcome. The table indicates the status of our management actions and denotes which actions have or will play the biggest role in making progress.

Step 3: Craft a compelling narrative.

What are our assumptions?

(1) Are you on track to achieve your Outcome by the identified date?

a. What is your anticipated deadline? What is your anticipated trajectory?

- Our anticipated deadline is 2025. By 2025, according to the Diversity outcome, it could be argued that we have achieved our outcome. The Diversity Workgroup has identified groups previously not engaged with the Chesapeake Bay Partnership and have created opportunities to meaningfully engage with these groups across the watershed. However, if we evaluate our diversity indicator, we cannot yet say whether or not we have met our diversity indicator goal. The anticipated trajectory for the diversity indicator goal is for the Chesapeake Bay Partnership to achieve a racial/ethnic representation that reflects the racial/ethnic demographics of the Chesapeake Bay watershed. Until another diversity profile is completed in 2019, 2022 and 2025, the diversity workgroup cannot officially determine if the Chesapeake Bay Partnership are meeting progress towards the anticipated trajectory. 2019 will be the first checkpoint to evaluate if the CBP is on track to achieving the Diversity outcome.

b. What actual progress has been made thus far? (List according to key or most important factors influencing; critical but would be good to choose one example of progress from each mgmt. approach)

- Communications and Outreach:

The Diversity Workgroup has identified key trusted leaders and interests of underrepresented communities. These groups have included, but are not limited to: EJ groups, HBCUs, faith-based leaders, and other non-profit groups across the watershed. The Diversity workgroup, after identifying these trusted leaders, have established forums to begin the dialogue to better understanding how community issues link to watershed restoration. These issues have been aging infrastructure, healthy food options, food security, lead poisoning, employment/professional development and grant funding.

- After connecting with community leaders, the Diversity Workgroup distributes a monthly Diversity Workgroup Update which includes available grants, employment opportunities, internships and upcoming events.

- Employment and professional Engagement:

The Diversity Workgroup has secured funding for a diversity engagement coordinator to engage underrepresented communities within the watershed. The diversity engagement coordinator has hosted various pilot environmental career events in Maryland, Virginia, and Washington D.C. Some of the following events are listed below:

- **Career Fairs**

- GBWC/Coppin State University Green Opportunities Fair
- Southeast CARE Coalition Black History EJ Forum/Green Careers Fair
- Naturally Latinos Conference/Green Jobs Fair
- Trees For All: Regional Chesapeake EJ Forum
- MD-DNR Partnership in Nature: Green Youth Listening Session
- National Environmental Justice Conference (NEJC)
- Latin American Youth Center DC – Green Careers Panel
- Presentation to Morgan State University Honors College
- Prince George’s County Public Schools Envirothon Conference
- Student Environmental Alliance Summit – Prince George’s County, MD


- The Diversity workgroup have begun to create meaningful relationships with the following universities: Bowie State University, Morgan State University, Norfolk State University, Virginia State University and the University of Maryland School of Public Health.

- Implemented mention of the Chesapeake Bay Partnership in EPA Region 3 MOU’s with Virginia State University and Bowie State University

- Promote Environmental Justice:

- Revised EPA grant guidance to incorporate diversity and environmental justice
- Revised NFWF grant guidance to incorporate diversity and environmental justice
- Increased and revised RFP mailing list to include more diverse potential applicants

- o Chesapeake Bay Watershed specific Environmental Justice Tool
- o Attended environmental justice listening sessions in Harrisburg, PA, hosted by PA-DEP.
- o Co-hosted with Southeast CARE coalition the Black History Month Environmental Justice Forum in Newport News, VA. We also facilitated the green jobs fair during this forum.
- o Co-hosted the Trees for All: Regional Chesapeake Environmental Justice Forum
- Tracking and Assessment
 - o The Diversity Workgroup completed the first diversity demographic profile with the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, which established the baseline participation of 13.4% communities of color within the Chesapeake Bay Partnership
 - o Compiled and refined the Workgroup, community member and stakeholder List



c. What could explain any existing gap(s) between your actual progress and anticipated trajectory? This should correlate with the factors influencing and the gaps identified in logic table.

- An existing gap that the Diversity workgroup faces, is the participation from state agencies to identify stakeholders within their respective jurisdictions that could serve as trusted community leaders to identify more intentional and targeted outreach opportunities. Increased state participation could also increase our knowledge of existing events in jurisdictions outside of the immediate Maryland-Bay area.

- It would benefit us to work closer with the communications team to create a communications strategy that the workgroup could work through to be more intentional in outreach efforts to successfully target communities to create employment and professional engagement opportunities.
- We have identified certain communities where there is a growing presence of youth becoming more interested in environmental sciences, but there are very few pathways, or programming in these communities to help them translate into a college major or career interest. This is a gap because it makes it difficult for the Diversity workgroup to assist in providing meaningful opportunities to the underrepresented communities we wish to engage with to create environmental stewards that may one day be interested in environmental employment and professional engagement opportunities.
- There is a lack of funding specifically in place to provide communities that face environmental justice, or organizations working on the ground with underrepresented communities that face these challenges to increase capacity in their efforts.
- A gap that currently exists within the Diversity workgroup, specifically management approach 3, is the absence of a strategy for identifying and addressing environmental justice issues across the CBP Partnership.
- In regards to management approach 4, the Diversity Workgroup has created a diversity indicator and established a baseline. We currently do not have a 2025 target goal for the diversity indicator. Setting a goal would help us establish how we are going to reach our goal by 2025. As of now, our only plan is to move closer to reflecting the ethnic/racial demographic makeup of the watershed, which currently sits at 35%.

Are we doing what we said we would do?

(2) Which of your management actions have been the most critical to your progress thus far? Why? Indicate which influencing factors these actions were meant to manage.

- Jurisdiction by jurisdiction stakeholder / workgroup meetings – The Diversity Workgroup conducted traditional stakeholder meetings, and as we began implementing the workplan, we hosted community/stakeholder listening sessions to help us learn about issues that certain communities face across the watershed. This is the beginning to successfully targeting communications and outreach.
- Publishing the diversity profile results that the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay conducted. The results of the profile helped create transparency of the demographics of our program. The diversity profile results were beneficial for measuring internal and external progress of the diversity indicator. This helped address the Diversity Workgroup’s factor to creating metrics and tracking tools as it pertains to the Partnerships demographics.
- Co-collaboration with state agencies and non-profit organizations across the watershed on outreach events and green job career fairs within underrepresented communities. By co-collaborating with state agencies and non-profit organizations, we have had the opportunity to engage with underrepresented communities that face environmental justice challenges while simultaneously also reaching communities to create employment and professional engagement opportunities.

(3) Which of your management actions will be the most critical to your progress in the future? Why? What barriers must be removed—and how, and by whom—to allow these actions to be taken? Indicate which influencing factors these actions will be meant to manage.

- The management board must remove the word “minority” from the 2014 Chesapeake Bay Agreement. From the listening sessions held and conversations with subject matter experts, it has been relayed that minority can be seen as a derogatory term to the underrepresented and underserved groups that we wish to engage with.
- In 2018, continue to explore the setting of a 2025 goal for diversity within the partnership.
- We must earn buy-in and input from jurisdictions and federal partners; if we identify existing programs such as the EPA Pathways, Maryland Conservation Corps, Chesapeake Conservancy Corps, Green Civic Works, Chesapeake Research Consortium Career development staffer program, etc., we could more affectively assess how the Partnership can collectively meet the Diversity Workgroup’s goal and outcome to engaging underrepresented communities in the existing programming across the watershed that assists in building the environmental workforce.
- The Chesapeake Bay Partnership can address more environmental challenges faced across the watershed if it partners with environmental justice organizations that are already addressing these issues. We must remove the communication barrier between these national environmental justice groups and the Chesapeake Bay Partnership. Increasing our presence in environmental justice work with these organizations will not only build our credibility in these communities, but also ensure that we are not recreating the wheel that existing groups have worked so hard to build. Partnership with these leaders is very important to engage with the environmental challenges that are faced by underrepresented communities.
- In 2018, explore collecting diversity data of Chesapeake Bay Program Partner organizations by jurisdiction and by agency. The Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay conducted a diversity profile for the entire partnership. However, it will make the work of the Diversity Workgroup more efficient, if we were to be able to learn which areas of diversity each jurisdiction is having specific challenges, it could help us be more intentional as to whom we should be working to engage with geographically.
- As our indicator is to see an increase in participation from members of communities of color in the Chesapeake Bay Partnership and leadership within the partnership, it behooves us to employ qualified and devoted professionals from communities of color. It will become increasingly difficult to expect communities and community leaders to continue to do heavy lifting as it pertains to getting communities involved without proper compensation. If we wish to engage a broader range of communities, it is important that these same organizations and agencies are employing members of these communities. It is also important that each jurisdiction/partner has either a diversity coordinator position or a diversity, equity and inclusion taskforce. This taskforce can act as the liaison between the community and state/federal agencies, and could act as the steering committee members of the diversity workgroup. When evaluating the composition of other workgroups, they consist of mostly employees of agencies/organizations of the existing partnership. With these positions, it will make it easier to also gain more insight to how jurisdictional partners are addressing their diversity, equity and inclusion goals, strategies and outcomes.

Are our actions having the expected effect?

(4) What scientific, fiscal or policy-related developments or lessons learned have changed your logic or assumptions (e.g., your recommended measure of progress; the factors you believe influence your ability to succeed; or the management actions you recommend taking) about your Outcome?

Due to the current administration, there is a level of uncertainty among stakeholders and many members of the Diversity workgroup, to the level of priority that will continue to be given to diversity and environmental justice issues within the program.

Jurisdictions providing their demographic data could also be useful to targeting priorities regarding intentional engagement moving forward. This will influence the Diversity Workgroup's ability to succeed in areas outside of the D.C. Metropolitan area.

(5) What would you recommend changing about your management approach? What new content will you include in your updated work plan?

- With this being the first workplan created by the Diversity Workgroup, there are a great number of expectations, without identified priorities and gradual steps to meet the vast number of expectations. For there to be quantifiable success within the indicator and workplan in general, priorities could become more concise, and guided by strategic plans. Streamlining and prioritizing the most critical factors/gaps within management approaches 1-3 should be highlighted to include at max, 4 or 5 action items per management approach.
- Remove the term, "minority" from the outcome language in Management Strategy as requested by stakeholders and members of the Diversity Workgroup.

Thus far, we have been very opportunistic in engaging with communities, but going forward we must be more intentional and expand our geographical base. It is important that we move outside of the Washington, D.C. Metropolitan area.

We are in the process of building the cultural competency training and development tools that will be a large part of the next diversity workplan/management strategy.

(6) What opportunities exist to collaborate across GITs? Can we target conservation or restoration work to yield co-benefits that would address multiple factors or support multiple actions across outcomes?

- There is always an opportunity to collaborate across GITs. We wish to get more communities of color involved in the decision making processes of the CBP. This can occur through increasing the presence of communities of color across the various workgroups that exist within the partnership. That is a small ask, once interested partners are identified either by the diversity workgroup, or other existing members within other workgroups, GITs and the Management Board.

- As the Diversity Workgroup moves forward with updating the Chesapeake Bay EJ Screen tool, it could be beneficial if other GITs and workgroups identify layers that could further the work of workgroups across the partnership and agencies within Jurisdictions. Specifically, the Diversity workgroup is asking
- As we move forward with the Cultural Competency Training and tools development, it will be important to have consistent communication and collaboration with the various workgroups, GITs and the management board to successfully accomplish the workshops and create the cultural competency development tools.
- As it pertains to environmental justice, we can always use more data from workgroups as it pertains to where the impacts of various workgroups (toxic contaminants, climate resiliency, public access and stewardship) are seeing trends that can negatively impact the health of disadvantaged communities.

How should we adapt?

(7) What is needed from the Management Board to continue or accelerate your progress

- Establish a position or committee dedicated to diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI) from each jurisdictional and federal partner to identify clear goals, strategies and outcomes within their respective agencies.
- A 2025 target set for the CBP Diversity Indicator.
- Remove the word “minority” from the Watershed Agreement outcome and management strategy.
- Provide status updates on revised state grant guidance to address DEI and environmental justice (EJ).
- Assistance in identifying areas and events where the CBP can increase our outreach efforts and participation with environmental justice organizations, local community groups and diverse populations.
- Identify potential funding for state-lead programming for environmental/green job pathways with an emphasis on water quality/water restoration.
- Increased participation from state and federal agencies to assess the demographic makeup of their workforce and the demographic make-up of agency leadership – conduct a diversity profile similar to what the CBP/Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay completed in 2016.

As we conduct the cultural assessment and cultural competency training modules, we need support from the management board and additional executive leadership within the state agencies, federal agencies and other participating members of the management board/CBP Partnership.

What is our financial status? What are our future financial needs?

(8) What are the anticipated sources of funding/resources (monetary or non-monetary)/financing opportunities outside the CBP that you anticipate would support this work? In other words, who else cares?

The communications workgroup has offered to help provide funding for various outreach materials that the workgroup may need.

Budget: No budget. Our budget currently comes through the GIT Funding Projects

CBT: Outreach to diverse communities small grants \$5,000

Better targeting of CBIG/CBRAP grants, as well as NFWF grant allocations to achieve diversity objectives.

Who else cares:

The director of the CBT is a member of the diversity workgroup.

(9) How did those sources of financing work in concert with other financing mechanisms or funding sources?

- Diversity workgroup needs to build upon the diversity, equity and inclusion strategy being completed by CBT and Choose Clean Water Coalition and how they've identified funding sources.

(10) What were the specific metrics used to determine project and/or funding success? Are those metrics currently incorporated into the current Management Strategy/Outcome/Workplan Action Item?

- The metrics that we use for our current funding sources are the following: The diversity Indicator, which evaluates the demographic analysis of the partnership, which is currently incorporated into the current Diversity workplan - management approach 4: tracking and assessing.
- We will consider using the EJ SCREEN tool to determine where CBP outcomes/workgroups projects and other grant funding should be placed to empower underrepresented communities.