

Biennial Strategy Review System

Local Leadership Outcome

Quarterly Progress Meeting Guide

Step 1: Summarize the Outcome.

Outcome: Local Leadership

Continually 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.

Lead and Supporting Goal Implementation Teams (GITs):

The Enhance Partnering, Leadership and Management Goal Implementation Team (GIT 6) leads the effort to achieve this outcome. It works in partnership with the Foster Chesapeake Stewardship Goal Implementation Team (GIT 5).

Participating Partners:

From Chesapeake Progress (**bold** = did not attend workgroup meetings over past workplan life cycle):

- The State of Delaware
- The State of Maryland
- The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
- The Commonwealth of Virginia
- The State of West Virginia
- The District of Columbia
- The Chesapeake Bay Commission
- **The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration**
- **The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers**
- The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
- **The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service**

Additional Active Workgroup Members (added throughout 2016-2018 timeline, but not represented on ChesapeakeProgress):

- Maryland Association of Counties
- Virginia Association of Counties
- Virginia Municipal League
- Virginia Conservation Network
- University of Maryland Harry Hughes Center for Agro-Ecology
- Pennsylvania State Association of Township Supervisors
- Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments
- University of Delaware
- University of Maryland National Center for Smart Growth
- Virginia Essex County Board of Supervisors Member
- Virginia Rappahannock-Rapidan Regional Commission
- Maryland Frederick County

- Maryland Prince Georges County
- Pennsylvania York County Planning Commission
- University of Maryland Environmental Finance Center
- National Fish and Wildlife Foundation
- Pennsylvania Department of Community and Economic Development
- Maryland League of Conservation Voters
- Local Government Advisory Committee

Progress:

To date, the Local Leadership Workgroup has supported several efforts, including: completing the “Strategic Outreach Education Program for Local Elected Officials in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed” report in August 2017;” approving the project approach for the “Implementation Support for Local Official Watershed Education and Capacity Building” project; and securing funding for the “Watershed Health Curriculum for Local Government Leadership” project. There is no expected trajectory established for the Local Leadership Outcome. Once a baseline measurement of knowledge and capacity of local elected officials has been established, there may be a means to measure and quantify trajectory and success.

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

See logic table.

Step 3: Craft a compelling narrative.

What are our assumptions?

- 1) What original assumptions did we make in our Management Strategy that we felt were important to our success?
 - a. What “Factors Influencing Success” were originally identified in your Management Strategy?
 - Competing interests for resources (people, time, money) and for the attention of local officials.
 - Accurate measurement and clear communication of positive changes in the watershed from natural resource, economic, and cultural perspectives.
 - Size, geography and civic and political complexity of the watershed which creates distinct regional needs.
 - Community support for protection and restoration activities and coordinated public relations to keep the public informed.
 - Wide disparity in level of existing knowledge and capacity among local officials.
 - Easy access to actionable and reliable information.
 - Political will
 - Consistent and focused state and federal program implementation at the local level.
 - An historical lack of focus on conservation and natural resource issues.
 - Increased awareness of changing environmental conditions (e.g. climate change and flooding).
 - Local culture and societal norms relating to conservation actions.
 - Creating a culture of excellence to showcase outstanding local leaders and initiatives.

- Available opportunities to increase knowledge at all levels of understanding.
 - Turnover rates of local elected and appointed officials.
- b. What programmatic gaps that fail to address those factors did you originally identify in your Management Strategy?
- Inadequate sharing of knowledge and information among jurisdictional agencies, conservation organizations and local officials.
 - Lack of a repository of information accessible to local officials and from trusted sources.
 - Minimal outreach to those outside the natural resources network.
 - Lack of awareness about training offerings, training funds, and how to access them.
 - Lack of time and funds for local officials to travel for training.
 - Lack of information about financing options for local environment projects.
 - No widely endorsed sources of information to enable local officials to identify and replicate action-oriented programs that have been successful in other jurisdictions.
 - No baseline curriculum for the watershed.
 - Success stories and committed local stewards visible only within the already committed conservation community.
 - Inconsistent focus on natural resource management in educational seminars, conducted by municipal and state associations, for local elected officials.
 - Inconsistent environment-focused training and information delivered through Planning District Commissions.
 - Inconsistent prioritizing and funding environment-related initiatives by the state.
 - No current baseline related to local officials' knowledge of watershed issues and capacity to implement watershed restoration and protection initiatives.
- c. What were the "Management Approaches" you chose to include in your Management Strategy and Two-Year Work Plan in order to address those gaps?
- 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.

Are we doing what we said we would do?

- 2) Are you on track to achieve your Outcome by the identified date?
- a. What is your target? What does this target represent (e.g., the achievement we believed could be made within a particular timeframe; the achievement we believed would be necessary for an Outcome's intent to be satisfied; etc.)?
- The outcome does not contain a numeric target, either short- or long-term.
 - The qualitative short-term (two-year) targets was to establish a baseline for measuring increase of knowledge and capacity by local elected official (Management Approach 0).
 - Deadline – December 2016 (missed; summer 2017 methodology considered by workgroup; methodology approved October 2018)
- b. What is your anticipated deadline? What is your anticipated trajectory?
- The outcome has a 2025 deadline; however, work is expected to continue on an indeterminate basis beyond that date.

- We do not have an anticipated quantitative trajectory at this time, nor do we have a way to measure progress along a trajectory.
 - The workgroup expects to have the initial baseline measurement completed before the 2020 SRS “Local Action” Quarterly Progress meeting, and will give an update on trajectory at this time.
- c. What actual progress has been made thus far?
- EcoLogix “Strategic Outreach Education Program for Local Elected Officials in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed report finalized in August 2017.
 - Funding for FY2016 “Implementation Support for Local Official Watershed Education and Capacity Building” project awarded in January 2017.
 - Proposed project approach approved by the workgroup in October 2018.
 - Funding for FY2017 “Watershed Health Curriculum for Local Government Leadership” approved
 - Barrier: Contract has not yet been awarded
 - Pennsylvania Local Government Roundtables and Virginia Local Elected Official Roundtables (Management Approach 2).
 - These roundtables were conducted by LGAC in an effort to expand peer-to-peer knowledge transfers amongst local elected officials
 - These roundtables were held in lieu of workgroup meetings; at the time of these roundtables, the Local Leadership Workgroup was undergoing a “reconstitution.”
- d. What could explain any existing gap(s) between your actual progress and anticipated trajectory?
- The Local Leadership Workgroup was stagnant for a period of 15 months between summer 2017 and fall 2018.
 - Due to various staffing issues and transitions in leadership
 - Workgroup has been “reconstituted” with new staff and new members; held “kickoff” meeting in October 2018.
- 3) 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.

Determining ways to capture the attention and focus of local officials and communities by incorporating the benefits of Bay protection and restoration activities into community local priorities (e.g. economic development, infrastructure, public health and safety – in short, those categories identified by the previously mentioned EcoLogix report). This is critical to success because if you don’t have the attention of the “boots on the ground” decision makers, restoration will not occur, which ultimately impacts our ability to meet all of the outcomes in the 2014 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement.

For example, competing interests for resources and attention of local elected officials is a major factor that will impact that ability to meeting this outcome. The actions that have been most critical to progress thus far are those that sought to address the following gaps related to this factor:

- Information exists, but is not being presented to local elected officials in a way that resonates with the priorities of their community
- There has been no assessment of the current opportunities (trainings, networking events, site visits, etc.) available that lend themselves to an enhanced education connection between Bay Program priorities and local priorities

For examples of management actions taken to manage this factor (and gaps), see “Actions” column in logic table.

- 4) 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 same answer from question #3 applies to progress in the future. In addition, increasing focusing on creating more opportunities for peer-to-peer knowledge transfers will be critical to future progress. The importance of peer-to-peer exchanges has been highlighted countless times in roundtables and conferences; focus groups of local elected officials indicated a preference for this type of learning.

The following barriers must be removed in order for these actions to be taken:

- Curriculum doesn’t exist in a form that resonates with local elected officials
 - This barrier is being addressed through a FY2017 GIT Funding project, contract pending
- Enhance the relationship between local elected officials, “trusted sources,” and jurisdictions
- Increase opportunities for local elected officials to have peer-to-peer conversations
 - The barrier will be addressed in the updated Local Leadership 2-Year Work Plan

These actions address the following factors:

- Competing interests for resources and attention of local officials
- Information provided is too technical
- Complexity of watershed creates distinct regional needs

Are our actions having the expected effect?

- 5) What scientific, fiscal, or policy-related developments or lessons learned (if any) 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?

No new developments or lessons learned have changed our logic or assumptions about the Outcome.

How should we adapt?

- 6) What (if anything) would you recommend changing about your management approach at this time? Will these changes lead you to add, edit, or remove content in your Work Plan? Explain.

We do not anticipate changing management approaches at this time. Because the baseline measurement has not yet been conducted, and because the workgroup has so recently been “reconstituted,” we do not feel that we have had enough time to fully assess the impact of the current management approaches, or if any changes in approach are warranted at this time.

- 7) 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?

The Local Leadership Workgroup is tracking all SRS Outcome “requests” that have a local government component, such as support in disseminating information to local elected officials in a way that resonates with their community priorities. The workgroup itself will not be targeting conservation or restoration work,

but rather is available to assist GITs and workgroups on an as needed basis with actions that require local government buy-in.

- 8) What is needed from the Management Board to continue or accelerate your progress? Multiple requests for action, support or assistance from the Management Board should be prioritized, where possible, and all requests should be “traceable” to the factors influencing progress toward your Outcome. Because a limited number of agencies and organizations are represented in the Management Board’s membership, we recommend naming those agencies and/or organizations that may play a key role in fulfilling your request for action, support, or assistance, in order to guide the Management Board in its work to contact, consult, or coordinate with partners.

At this time, the Local Leadership Workgroup does not require action, support, or assistance from the Management Board. The workgroup has put several efforts into place (at the workgroup level) to address barriers to achieving the outcome. If significant obstacles are encountered before the November 2020 “Local Action” Quarterly Progress meeting, the workgroup may reconsider a request for assistance from the Management Board.