**Executive Summary**

(To be written by the Comm Team)

**Outcomes and Baselines**

*Stewardship Goal:* Increase the number and diversity of local citizen stewards and local governments that actively support and carry out the conservation and restoration activities that achieve healthy local streams, rivers and a vibrant Chesapeake Bay.

*Local Leadership Outcome:* 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.

*Necessary explanatory information:*

* Define local officials.
* Discuss increasing the knowledge and capacity; capacity increases the soft leadership skills.
* Clarify what is included in issues related to water resources (e.g., land conservation is included). Make the connection with natural resources.

*Baselines:*

* The outcome says, “Continually increase the knowledge and capacity of local officials.” What programs are currently in place?
* “According to LGAC members and signatory representatives, the local official’s knowledge of watershed issues and capacity to implement watershed restoration and protection initiatives varies quite dramatically throughout the watershed.” (from outcome justification document)
* “The outcome measure has not been developed; therefore, currently there is no identified baseline.” (from outcome justification document)
* Baseline involves multiple factors: the knowledge and capacity of local officials as well as current/existing programs and models (current existing programs may be included in current efforts and gaps). Baselines don’t need to be exclusive of each other.
* Baseline should be more oriented to current activities and management actions. Baselines are the methods for current efforts, and our planned work will increase the range of methods and make them work better.
* Measuring the knowledge and capacity of local officials is difficult. This might be accomplished by a pre-work survey to measure the knowledge and capacity of local officials. People may be asked to self-determine their own knowledge.
* Continually increasing the knowledge and capacity requires us to institute a system of learning for local officials (there is a turnover every couple of years).
* Include an estimated number of educational programs, online resources, etc. Connect this back to the baseline of the range of methods for increasing knowledge and capacity.
* Assess existing training programs for local officials that have a limited level of training. Consider increasing specificity for what should be included in the training.

**Jurisdictions and Agencies Participation in the Strategy**

* Unable to address which signatories and stakeholders will be participating in implementation at this time.
* List of signatories who have indicated that they will participate in the development of the strategy: (insert list)

*Local Engagement:* There is a specific, critical role for local governments. Additionally, watershed associations, NGOs, etc. play a critical role in reaching local officials. On Dec. 3, 2014, there will be a workshop to include local officials, watershed associations, nonprofits, and private groups in the MS development. This will be a time to receive feedback from these groups.

**Factors Influencing Ability to Meet Goal**

* Election cycles affect ability to meet our ultimate goal of increasing knowledge and capacity.
  + This will keep us from being able to achieve the outcome.
* Local political will/local issues. Competing local interests.
* Economy/funding
  + lack of staff/training/resources
  + lack of funds to enact conservation actions
* Culture: smaller jurisdictions may not be as “progressive” or interested. This is a capacity issues. They might not have the data to show the issues.
* Definition of local official. (elected, appointed, and staff of local government)
* Wide variation of existing knowledge and capacity. There is a broad range of need.
* Changing climatic conditions and linking that to actions that also help Bay restoration efforts.
* Lack of clarity in available data that will show that local officials’ efforts will create change. Ability to clearly communicate positive change in the watershed from a natural resource perspective to help support efforts to increase knowledge and capacity to do more.
* Clear communications about positive economic and culture implications of better natural resource management.
* Climate change could increase our ability to achieve the outcome because more people are more responsive to our need to address the issues.
* Factors related to implementing economic and policy incentives: competing political interests.
* Green business as an economic incentive for local political leaders to engage.
* Eco-tourism, fisheries, and other industries that give incentive to protect natural resources.
* Lack of capacity at the local level to really understand how to use tools.
* From STAC:
  + Natural systems:
    - conditions/structure
    - process
  + Human system factors:
    - Sufficient knowledge
    - Ability to engage local officials
    - Demonstration that the benefits outweigh the cost to local officials
    - Assumption that policy/economic incentives will be beneficial
    - Need for a cost/benefit analysis to demonstrate that the benefits outweigh the costs
    - Inventory of knowledge and capacity
    - What do we mean by capacity and how do we measure it?
    - Who/what are the local officials
    - What are their needs
    - How is information delivered effectively to local officials- different than delivery at other levels
    - Effective policy in place for achieving goals
    - Development of policy incentives
    - Identification of thought leaders who influence local jurisdictions
    - Adequate financial resources (administration and incentives)
    - Development of economic incentives
    - Adequate extension infrastructure (outreach and tech assistance)
    - Identification of key consortia in states who organize and dessimate information and are looked to for leadership by jurisdictions.

*Current Efforts*

* Existing training programs: LGAC meeting, associations that have required certification training programs, Natural Resources Leadership Institute (NRLI)
* Describe the range of efforts that are currently in place.

*Gaps*

* Gaps related to Factors Influencing:
  + Lack of funding
  + Communication mechanisms, path for specific communication of natural resource issues.
* Agency efforts to disseminate knowledge and information to local officials and local staff.

*Actions, Tools or Technical Support Needed to Empower Local Government and Others*

* Targeted funding for local environmental issues.
* Regional targeted education and training.
* Municipal leagues and associations will need assistance with developing programs.
  + Sharing best ideas for legislation and innovative funding.
* Increased involvement from entities like the Environmental Finance Center.
* More frequent and complete communication.
* Improved best practices in watershed restoration and protection (e.g., policies, finance) library for each target audience.
* Mentoring system of local officials (similar to peer to peer). Incorporating retired local officials who have institutional knowledge.
* A tool that can assess the needs for training and education (needs assessment).

**Management Approach**

* Increasing communication frequency
* Determining a sustainable source of funding for increasing knowledge and capacity.
* Identifying multiple benefits
* Creating more affordable opportunities to achieve training and education needed to increase knowledge and capacity.
  + Add modules on to existing training/certification programs.
* Regularly assess the effectiveness of programs and methods.
  + Use metrics.
* Greater acknowledgement/recognition of existing state programs.

*Local Engagement*

* Ask workshop attendees: What would increase your participation in these approaches?
* What is the range of methods people find most effective?
* What is the role of non-academic publications in local leaders’ decision-making?
* How would you establish local centers of knowledge? Is there a network in place for local officials to affiliate themselves with?
  + Local planning district commissions.
* Integrate with other appropriate outcomes/management strategies to meet needs in underserved communities.
* Incentivize the underserved community to achieve greater knowledge and capacity (e.g., scholarships to the local leadership academy).

**Monitoring Progress**

* Utilize surveying instruments.
  + Before and after training surveys
  + Succinct as a mobile surveying center.
* Accounting of contacts, meetings, and tracking.
* Social network diagrams. Social media.
* Case study approach (highlight various things through time).
* Measuring the number of people going through the leadership academies.
* Increasing access to economic and policy incentives
* Tracking voting
* League of Conservation Voters to do measurement of economic and policy actions by local officials. Development of a score card.
* Municipal leagues or association annual assessment of membership.
* Chesapeake Stormwater Network annual survey of members to assess programming.
* Determine the different mechanisms for the different categories of local officials (e.g., elected vs. senior staff)

**Assessing Progress**

* At least every 2 years.
* Local officials should be engaged in the process of assessing progress.
* Criteria to be used to determine how the program is working.
* The scale of the reach among the things we’re doing
* Measured engagement

**Adaptively Manage**

* Utilize the Dec. 3 workshop workgroup as our MS working group on this issue.
  + Signatory reps will be on this workgroup.
* Based on information we gain on what is effective and not effective while considering the cost of what we use.