2023 SRS Biennial Meeting
May 11-12, 2023

Chesapeake Bay Café Day 2 Question #1 Summary

★ *Denotes multiple tables or persons at the same table repeating or prioritizing the same item.*

(#) *Denotes the table number(s) that addressed that question.*

Value of the Partnership (EC Charge #7, #8, #9) Key Takeaways

- We need to **define our partnership** (e.g., a convener of partners, technical assistance providers). We shouldn't try to be all things to everyone. We provide resources and information to those at the local level; however, we are not the engager of individuals at the local level.
- We need to **remove "inside" "outside" perspective**, where it seems to be EPA versus everyone else. We need to move past the "know the rules mentality" and be a more open minded, creative, and solution driven. (1)
- Water travels beyond jurisdictions. Participation and focus depend on **geographic location**. Do we need the **public to know about the partnership**? Will we (we equals all partners) sum up the accomplishments of the partnership at the end of 2025? (5)
- The **partnership is a Network of Networks and accessing the broad partnership requires understanding the connections and being strategic** about how to involve those whose voices that are not contributing. The Beyond 2025 Steering Committee needs to utilize our networks (and the resources they bring) more effectively. The work should not just focus on the outcomes but our governance, how we work, and how we can bring others into the work. We should be engaging others not just outreaching to others. (9)
- There is a **strong sense of the value of our work** which stands on sound science and science excellence**. (13)
- There is collective interest in improving the value of the partnership by **garnering greater direction and representation of more socially-derived perspectives on how to manage the resources going forward** (i.e., interpreted or translated by me as CBP demonstrating a greater use of social science in support of our work going forward), and bringing in new partners. (13)
- There would be a loss without the partnership that **would touch every dimension of the work and focus** of our management targets and efforts. (13)
- As we hear calls for accelerating progress, we **need to slow down** as we have intense internal schedules for the (staff) resources available. This may be a capacity issue, or a need to look into how we do our business each day to achieve our goals and outcomes and assess our efficiency and effectiveness with our available time and resources. (13)
- For increasing value to all communities, we need to **create more time and allow more space for greater interaction and collaboration with the public** to ensure representation of perspectives. We should also **assess how the CBP conducts business**, inviting new approaches into our work, generating greater balance across investments addressing diverse outcomes, all while better managing expectations. (13)

1.0	Value of the Partnership (EC Charge #7, #8, #9))
1.1	What is the value of the Partnership to you in restoring/protecting/improving the Bay and its watershed? What would make it more valuable to you? What would add value? (EC Charge #8, #9)

Value of the Partnership
- Stability of goals regardless of politics (1)
- **Collective responsiveness** (5)
- **Consistency and stability of the CBP**. CBP always has a direction. (1)
- Supports a waterbody important to me (1)
- **Committed partnership** that works on the things I care about. (9)
- Network of coordinators who **have the trust** of audiences we are trying to reach (1)
- Access to very smart **people with expertise** in so many more areas. (9)
- So many **dedicated** people working together toward improvement/protection. (9)
- **Network** of talent, passion, experience, dedication (5) (13) ★
- New partners (13)
- Provides more **touchpoints** to be connected to the program. (9)
- Provides a **means to get the important work done** – work that can't be done by a few. (9) ★
- **Stronger together.** (9) ★
- Massive network: we have so much talent, expertise, attention, etc. in the partnership, we just **don't know how to leverage it**. (5) ★
- **Funding** to jurisdictions and local stakeholders (1)
- Partnerships **amplify voices** that otherwise wouldn't be heard (or even listened to). (5)
- Partnership is obviously **beneficial to our work, not for our messaging**. We barely know what CBP is, why would the public? (5)
- **Cooperative federalism** (5)
- **Leverage, influence** (5) ★
- "Tragedy of the commons" (5)
- **Career development** (staffer and intern programs) and career pathways opportunities. (9)
- No other way for success (9)
- Community of **like-minded people I can trust** to talk through ideas, questions, and challenges. (9)
    - o Build fellowship into the work. It's a required. It's normalized. Not tangential to the work.
- The partnership is a **Network of Networks**. (9) ★
    - o We should be more deliberate how we access it.
    - o Represent the network reach visually.
    - o Include Appalachia and farmers.
    - o "LinkedIn" for different outcomes, stakeholders, source sectors (e.g., industry, ag), novel partners.
    - o Go beyond a list of workgroup members on each webpage. Document the CBP to grassroots network connections. For example, maybe Choose Clean Water Coalition (CCWC) has a database of local NGOs and tag their organizations by outcome/goal. Then workgroups can use CCWC to connect with communities through trusted sources to evaluate and expand the fall implementation process. Identify linkages and key communicators between stakeholders. CBP ←→CCWC ←→NGOs←→Community (9) ★

What would make it more valuable to you? What would add more value?

- Overhaul the **SRS process**. (9)
- Tap into the **network of NGOs** for advocate and outreach efforts. (13)
- **Make it relevant to the communities** even if, and especially if not, environmentally-focused (13)
- **Slow down**! Intense internal deadline schedule. (13) ★
- More value in figuring out how to get out data /tools used. Technical **trainings**. (9) ★
- **More visibility** could increase partners and more buy-in with tools. (9)
- If we can find a much more **streamlined, effective way to operate as a network.** (9)
- **"One stop shop"** for Bay info, partner info, science, data. (9)
- Be more of a **partnership of people with the highest stakes in the environmental issues** we're trying to tackle. (9)
- **Work with industries** - ag, fertilizer, development. (9)
- Partnership **funding directed by the partnership**. (9)
- Absolute need to **revisit governance/policy and goals/outcomes**, in addition to strategies for achieving goals. Could be we keep most or simply technical tweaking. (9)
- Providers of a vision supporting a **future grounded in the wellbeing of humans and living resources**. (13)
- **Access to facts and statistics** to communicate effectively. (13)
- **Provides an audience of all the government agencies** once a year. (13)
- Base for **awareness of socially important issues.** (13)
- Access to **different perspectives and collaborative opportunities** to find and work on solutions of complex issues. (13)
- **News using enhanced thinking**. (13)
- Value in the **exchange of ideas**, learning new things. (13)
- The **network**. (13)
- (The partnership is…) Not about me! (It's about/…) **for others**! (13)
- See **new places**. (13)
- Fabulous **interdisciplinary science.** (13)
- **Credible science**. (13)
- **Wealth of interdisciplinary knowledge** is inspiring. (13)
- **Long history of work and wisdom to leverage and improve** our success in the face of present and future challenges. (13)

1.2 How would you make the Partnership more valuable to all communities? (EC Charge #7, #8, #9)

Increased Effort
- **Do more** to protect waters before impairment, focus on conservation (1)

Broaden Perspectives
- Terminology can divide people. Need **broader perspective when communicating**. (1)
- Need **holistic perspective**, not just focus on things in isolation. (1)
- Representation. (13)
- **Define "all" and "community"**. (13)

Outreach & Communications
- So much data (is it being used and shared effectively?), we are in "collection mode" we need to **tailor outreach** after hearing what is important to people and communities. (1)
- Analysis paralysis: so much talk about **data, not being translated** to public audiences (1)

- CBP should not communicate/engage with general public, we should **rely on trusted sources working at the local level**. (1)
- **Trusted sources to understand and communicate** use data based on needs (1)
- Haven't looked at **how our data/info can be used with various audiences and to be relevant** to each audience. More just dump of data without strategic connections. (1)
- **Small group connection** opportunities (1)
- Approach outcomes with **people-centered social science**. (13)
- Be intentional about **time for public participation**, not instant checking-a-box (13)
- We can expand our value to the people in the watershed if we **expand our views** of what we think will lead to a healthy environment. (9)
- Ask communities, stakeholders **what is actually needed.** (1)
- Spend more time getting to know others motivations/ways of thinking. (13)
- Let them tell the partnership to **understand what communities want**. (13)
- More time for **building and maintaining relationships**. (13)
- **New approach-ideas and outreach**. (13)

Partnership & Collaboration
- Work on **consensus building** – using areas where there is already agreement first (1)
- Workgroups / leadership or GIT leadership should be worked into job descriptions so that partners working within the partnership are not "volunteers**." Partnership work should be part of job description** within the state or whatever home agency/organization. (1)
- Get potential litigants in the room before a next lawsuit, to get them to **partner and problem-solve**. (5)
- Partnership will change. Need to take advantage of turnover to **bring new perspectives** and integrate more partners. (9) (13) ★
- Bring **more diverse staff into the partnership** at all levels; broader perspective and representation of those who live in the watershed. (5)
- It's not enough to invite to the dance, we have to ask him/her/them to dance (i.e., the **partnership/engagement**). (5) ★
- **Stronger partnerships to leverage resource** to implement projects that meet multiple objectives. (5)
- A **broader group and more engaged stewards** in every neighborhood. (5)
- Willingness of partnership to **increase flexibility of rules** (e.g., TMDL). (5)
- More **safe space for collaboration**. ★
- Requires **engaging stakeholders as equal partners** and developing watershed "principles" for local implementation, fostering **collaborative learning**. (9)

Focus of Our Work
- **Not focus solely on BMPs** and feeding the model but on all of the outcomes (1)
- Focus on **land/forest conservation** (1)

Funding & Resources
- **More jurisdictional discretion** on how and where funds can be implemented. (5)
- **Trust-based grant making**. (13)
- **Stratified resource allocation** across goal and outcome areas to provide more equitable and inclusive management; better represent allocations across the spectrum of "communities" (e.g., based on race, socio-economic gradient, interest group character, etc.). (13)

<u>General</u>
- **Manage expectations**. (13)
- The **whole is greater** than the sum of its parts. (13)

<u>Specific Recommendations</u>
- We need **"coordinators" (not GIT coordinators) in both worlds, technical / public** – one foot in each world. Information specialists, liaisons, circuit riders, connectors, translators at the local level. (1)
- There is significant **concern/fear that anything new (2025 work) will require regulated/unregulated communities to do more**. (1)
- **Stop the data collection on a specific date**. (5)
- Potential to **reduce transaction costs for implementation** at the local scale. (9)
- Creating space for **qualitative information to inform adaptive management**. (13)
- Listen to the **advice of your Advisory Committees** – they are telling you (how to) define who your target audience is. (13)
- **Breaking down hierarchy**. (13)
- **New on the ground practices** that are supported at the ground level. (13)

1.3	What is at risk without having the Partnership? (EC Charge #8, #9)

<u>Funding & Resources</u>
- **Funding** (1) (5) (9) (13) ★
- Threat and tensions around **money** (1)
- **Resources and power** which we can leverage to fulfill our vision if we listen and put our resources behind POC lead groups who have been doing environmental work in the Bay for a long time (9)
- Headwater states would **lose resources and motivation**. (9) ★

<u>Cooperation, Collaboration & Coordination</u>
- Interstate **conflict** – with jurisdictions only focusing on themselves (1)
- Interstate **cooperation** with regulatory components makes us stronger (1)
- **Cooperation** among jurisdictions (1)
- **Uncoordinated attempts at conservation/restoration** (13)
- **Connection** with others (legislature, NGOs, etc.) (5)
- **Collaboration** (9) (13) ★

<u>Perspectives</u>
- **Differing perspectives** on topics – leads to better solutions (1)
- **Different voices** at the table (1)

<u>Learning & Knowledge</u>
- Multijurisdictional **learning and approaches** (13)
- Opportunities for **learning** (5)
- Institutional **knowledge** and history of the Bay (5) ★
- **Innovation, Creativity** (1) (5) ★

<u>Accountability</u>
- **Legitimacy** (1)
- **Accountability** for our work, we have accountability (for TMDL, WQ) to produce and do things (BMPs) but not to produce outcomes (WQ) (5) (1) ★
- **Lack of defensible science** to drive policy (13)

<u>Leadership & Partnership</u>

- A lack of an **example to other watershed partnerships** around the country and world (1)
- Without **partnership**, we lose! (5)
- Harmful impacts from **wrong decision makers** (13)
- Bad or no **leadership** (13)
- **Unified voice** (1)

Other
- Mobilized **science** (1)
- **Data** related to wildlife, water quality, land use, etc. would be lost. (9)
- **Technical assistance** (9)
- **Motivation** to enact collective change (13) ★
- **Congressional justification** (9)
- Without **stakeholders** we ultimately lose the Bay and watershed. (5)
- **Environmentally and socio-economically enhanced** Bay and watershed (13) ★
- **Back-sliding**, especially given climate change and socio/demographic/economic trends in the region. (9)
- Increased **impacts** of a growing population and its lifestyle effects without any management or acknowledgement to living resources and human health (13) ★