Chesapeake Bay Café Day 2 Question #2 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.*

Stakeholder Engagement (EC Charge #7, #8, #9)
Key Takeaways

- **Stakeholder engagement needs to go both ways**. In addition to inviting them to our meetings, we need to extend efforts to go to them for collaboration beyond just "listening". There should be a **communication flow path both to and from stakeholders** that feeds back to the partnership through trusted sources. (2) (6) ★
- Our **outreach to stakeholders isn't enough**; not broad enough, not targeted enough, not outside our usual paths, not active enough, (passive), not diverse enough. But we don't seem to have the capacity to do more. (14)
- **Connect our partnership to the existing networks** to move information in both directions and become the feedback loops to inform our work. (10)
- Acknowledge that **larger corporations are stakeholders** as well, and they have varying levels of interest in engagement depending on their relationship with members of the CBP. Maybe taking initiative to hear their perspectives to understand. (2)
- **Marginalized communities look different in different places**. How we engage with them should be location dependent. (2)
- **More resources are needed for communication and engagement of our stakeholders** – both to gather and process that information. (6)
- We **don't have enough trained communicators, trusted sources, or translators**. (14)
- **Go into community with authentic engagement and LISTEN** to their needs, not with our list. (10)
- **Get beyond our traditional sphere** to include watershed organizations, community organizers and advocates, conservation districts and volunteer groups. (10)
- **Communication to the public at large should run through trusted sources** versus coming from the Bay office. (6)
- If you aren't **geared up for a good engagement strategy**, don't do it. It's hard to undo badcomms/engagement. (6)
- There was an overarching theme of frustration and acknowledgement of the **lack of authentic engagement**. However, the majority of comments were suggestions in how it could be improved. Authentic relationships, going to practitioners and those on the ground implementing efforts, and thoughtful mitigation of bureaucratic processes. (virtual 2)
- Consider **making Choose Clean Water Coalition a signatory** on behalf of stakeholders, practitioners and NGO community. (10)
- Need to **engage the Ag Industry**. Biggest focus for needed nutrient reductions. (6)
- **Urban sector should have a technical assistance mechanism** similar to Ag. Ag extension offices are an example of this. Will require training and development of staff. (6)
- **Co-develop actions, plans, agreements when in community and invest in and recruit community organizers** to bridge to hyper local community level. (10)
- Need **better branding for CBP**. (14)

- Need to **manage expectations more**. (14)
- Need to do a better job of **flipping the narrative** in our favor. (14)
- We should have a **full-on partnership conference about our goals** (and outcomes). (14)
- **Increased clarity in roles of Advisory Committee members** would increase efficiency when communicating needs to MB and this may not even be the correct channel for addressing the identified needs. Maybe a dedicated facilitator between these groups could address this challenge. (2)
- Have **authentic engagement with our own Advisory Committees** throughout the year and show action that directly correlates to their recommendations. (10)
- We should **recognize the strengths of Advisory Committees** and how to leverage them better. We should bring them more into our regular work (brief them more; seek advice more), provide more briefings to them. (14)
- We need to **educate partners about who and what the Advisory Committees are** and how they can help us. Integrate them into the feedback/learning loops. (14)

2.0 Stakeholder Engagement (EC Charge #7, #8, #9)

2.1 What concerns do you have with stakeholder engagement? (EC Charge #7, #8, #9)

- Starting at **making restoration relevant to all communities is presumptive**. (2)
- **Stakeholders may have different priorities**. Need to know how to engage the information properly. "Bait the hook to the fish you want to catch." (virtual 2) ★
- Stakeholders are **interested in taking action**. They may not even bother reading a report card. (virtual 2) ★
- **Human health is a major concern** for stakeholders that is under-discussed. (virtual 2)
- **Incorporation often disingenuous**. (2)
- **If it's not in the regulations, they won't do it**. Need a carrot or a stick for local officials. (2)
- Stakeholder engagement **takes funding/resources**. (2)
- **Always need more capacity** – to both engage and process the information once obtained. (6)
- **Capacity to effectively engage** stakeholder groups. (6)
- **Stakeholder engagement costs them money and time**. Do we pay them? (2) ★
- **Invest in boots on the ground.** Skillset needed for cold calling, use wetlands as an example that had a steering committee comprised of fed agencies and grantee, where not enough other folks being engaged. Had to cold call many people. (6)
- **Use the word "engagement" pretty literally**. What does that mean to each of us? Defining that looks different for different stakeholder groups. (2)
- As EPA say "come to the table" to stakeholders, but **often they are working people who can't afford to come to the table during the day**. (2)
- **Listening** before speaking. (virtual 2)
- **Just listening isn't collaborative**. (2) ★
- If consistently running against deadlines, it's **tough to allow for adequate time for hearing feedback**. (2)
- Always feels like a **transactional conversation**. (2)
- Never seems to be any **conversation around participatory decision making**. (2)
- Old school **social science** where it is very one-way. (2) ★

- **Became more involved in CBP meetings during covid** because it finally leveled the virtual field. Always had virtual call-in option, but the callers were the "out-crowd". Game changer. (2)
- **Meeting technology needs to enable equal hearing of voices** who call in. (2)
- **Biases are carried forward** in work. (2)
- There should be **negative BMP credits**. (2)
- **Stakeholder engagement needs to have infrastructure** built before shifting focus from water quality. (2)
- **Question being asked determines who the stakeholders are**. How do you engage stakeholders that **don't know they are stakeholders**? (2) (6) ★
- **Need diversity** – not just racial diversity. Be aware of the audience. (6)
- It's clear we are not engaging ALL **RELEVANT stakeholders.** (10)
- Do all of us agree on **who our stakeholders are** and who they should be and that ALL stakeholders have been identified? (10) (virtual 2) ★
- **Engage them sooner** in the process and move toward co-production of plans and implementation. (10)
- **Talk to the jurisdiction about who their stakeholders**, engage communities at that level. Not sure at what level. Need to have this at certain scope. Need to have town hall meetings throughout the watershed when rolling things out to get input. (6)
- Ability to **manage stakeholder concerns in an equitable manner** – tradeoffs – how do you reconcile opposing viewpoints. (6)
- **Structured decision making**. (6)
- **Determine what the cutoff is for too much input** – meaning we can't handle all the input and become paralyzed. (6)
- **Not everyone should be communicating with certain stakeholders.** What level of entities should be engaging with what stakeholders? What is the division of labor and Expectations/roles for stakeholder engagement. Make sure everyone understands the roles and we don't duplicate efforts. (6)
- **If much of the implementation is LOCAL, need to engage at a LOCAL LEVEL** (over 2,000+ communities) to reach local elected officials, planners, volunteer groups, watershed organizations, community advocates, community organizers, conservation districts) and acknowledge this is really hard but if we use our network of networks, it is possible! (10)
- We are set up now mostly to interact with state or goal implementation team/workgroup level and some local leaders – **need to evolve so information flows down** to the hyper local level and back up the chain to create better feedback loops (and clarify who does this, not just the highest level Chesapeake Bay Program staff). (10)
- Reaching out to some **stakeholder groups in our individual silos**. (14)
- **Total number of stakeholder** and capacity to reach them. (14)
- Some local governments are **defensive when Chesapeake is the topic**. (14)
- **Confusing CBP with CBS**. (14)
- **Confusing VIMS with VMRC or VMI**. (14)
- **Lack of trust** in government results in who is interested (and engaged). (14)
- Acknowledge **we may not have all the expertise** in our staffing or goal teams and leverage expertise from those already engaged – connect to the networks. (10)
- **Trained communicators are lacking** (i.e., we don't have enough). (14)

- **Translator communicators are lacking**. (14)
- **Scientists are not necessarily trained in stakeholder engagement**. (14)
- **Passive not active or intentional advertising** [to stakeholders]. (14)
- **Personal/citizen experience versus science observation**. (14)
- **Managing expectations**. (14)
- **Time commitment conflicts**. (14)
- Lack of time commitment but **unwilling to give up control or authority**; we are not always right. (14)
- When performing engagement, still feel **challenged in getting back the information learned** to the top of the beast. (virtual 2)
- **Bureaucracy can severely limit engagement** - extensive review requirements. (virtual 2) ★

2.2	What excites you about stakeholder engagement? (EC Charge #7, #8, #9)

- **Funding** for community organizations. (2)
- **Be holistic** when working with local and state governments. (2)
- **Involvement of larger corporations** that are providing the financial incentives for local planners to make decisions. (2)
- **Effective stakeholder engagement**. CBP connects with organizations that are connected with stakeholders. Should be an engagement line – flow path – decision tree. CBP need to get info to trusted sources who are the feedback loop to the CBP. (6)
- Consider **regional listening sessions** as part of existing meetings but do them IN COMMUNITY. (10)
- **Model of bussing local officials** from one part of the partnership to another. Allows for individual, human perspectives. CBP needs to have more direct outreach to get these perspectives, between CBP staff and stakeholders. (2)
- Opportunity to **link to existing Partnerships and communities** that have a pulse on needs. (virtual 2)
- Establish a **team travel to communities and conduct roundtable discussions** to gather input to envision goals reflective of community interests. (virtual 2)
- **Get out there more**. Speakers Bureau in Communications Office. Send people out with canned presentations and meet the people. (virtual 2)
- **Working directly with community organizations**. Let them do what they're best at. (2)
- **Inside versus outside voices**: CAC versus Diversity workgroup. Revise diversity outcome to account for stakeholder engagement beyond staff representation. Go out to the community. (2)
- In outreach work for citizen science on SAV, the some felt there were larger fish to fry for the organization he is representing (and we agreed). **Have an understanding of the priorities** of these organizations when working with them. (2)
- Work with **trusted sources to develop factsheets** for the trusted sources to deliver information to the stakeholders. (6)
- Need to **tie Into the Ag industry**. Farm bureaus, producer industry, integrator – this needs to be outside the workgroups. Where does the info come from. Workgroups to - State Ag agencies – info should be run through the state ag agencies – and then to the stakeholders. Should we have an ag advisory committee? (6)
- The real **restoration/conservation/behavior change occurs at the local, parcel, stream reach scale** where people have a passion, care about results and action. (10)

- **Go to where these passionate and engaged stakeholders** are located and LISTEN. (10)
- **Partner with existing networks and community organizations**, be inspired and grow our perspectives. (10)
- **Get new and different ideas** (you don't know what you don't know). Receive **diverse perspectives**. (10) (14) ★
- Bring new stakeholders in early to **envision/refine new goals**. (virtual 2) ★
- Can/should **Choose Clean Water Coalition** become an EC signatory on behalf of NGO/practitioners? (10)
- Ask **Choose Clean Water Coalition and riverkeeper network** along with other watershed organizations how we can connect these networks to create the continuum of engagement and expand our Bay Program reach. (10)
- All meetings are **open to the public**. (14)
- **Learning where your message doesn't resonate** to adapt your message. (14)
- Learning how to **flip the narrative**. (14)
- **Listen to create action at local level**. (14)
- **Hearing and learning from others**. (14)
- Full on the **Chesapeake partnership conference on Goals**. (14)
- **Stop justifying bad policies**. (14)
- **Building trust to get honest feedback** during stakeholder feedback takes a lot of time and often requires traveling to communities. (virtual 2) ★
- **Use the breadth of EPA to better communicate** (public affairs, etc. - and money in those offices). (virtual 2)
- Integrate engagement with work plans to **have accountability of the action.** (virtual 2)
- Potential for **reorganizing the way the CBP is setup**. Stakeholders should have input in how the Bay Program is structured - operationally, how can we better serve. (virtual 2) ★

2.3 Consider the stakeholders represented on the three Advisory Committees, what does "effectively hearing from and listening to" them look like? (EC Charge #8)

- Our **marginalized communities look different in different locations**. Advisory Committees may be a better place to tackle that. (2)
- **Lack of clarity amongst members of CAC and LGAC** about what their role is. (2)
- **Recognizing strengths of Advisory Committees** and how to leverage them. (14)
- More people in the partnership should **know who and what the Advisory Committees are**. (14)
- **Reorganize how Advisory Committees provide recommendations**, engage throughout the year, make sure the recommendations are actionable, and that time is spent considering, discussing and workshopping the recommendations as they arise rather than being relegated to a letter and response. (10)
- We are in love with talking, but **not as much action**. **Show the response in action and change** (actions speak louder than words on a paper). (2) (10) ★
- When called by representative **asking MB member what it is they need to do, they don't know** either. (2)
- **Purpose-driven work**. Expected outcomes. (2)
- **Using facilitator** between Advisory Committees and MB. (2)
- **Everyone (Advisory Committee) needs a CESR report.** (6)
- Need to have **entities working in the urban sector** like the Ag extension offices. (6)

- o   Heat islands, stormwater
- o   Need workforce development for this activity
- o   How do we get to the developers and have them go green/resilient
- o   Need to show them how it makes things better/save money
- o   Need to be able to translate your message into something that they care about (reduce flooding, going green can be cost effective.)
- **Bay Commission could help** with that (i.e., funding). (6)
- **Local Gov Advisory Committee** could play a role in this (6)
- How do we **make CAC that is truly representative of the people in the watershed.** (6)
- **CAC could work through local churches** – faith-based tradition to care for the earth (6)
- Need to **go to the Advisory Committees to gather information** on how we should be changing our goals. Need to gather that input so we can provide input back to the CBP. (6)
- Need to **train/employ people** to be translators and gatherers of information. (6)
- **Don't need to have everyone understand the science**, just want a happy healthy existence, and to protect their family. (6)
- Need to **develop a meaningful strategy to get to know the Advisory Committee members**, who they are and how they work as well as what they prioritize (don't assume) (10)
- **Engage in meaningful discussion**, not check the box responses to letters once a year. Consider new ways for Advisory Committees to provide advice beyond their annual letter to Executive Council, e.g., using special reports on topics or quarterly meeting report outs that lead to a discussion throughout the year with the partners on priority key topics. (10)
- **More time to understand and discuss** advice. (14)
- Going to them (repetitively), instead of requesting their input. **Authentic engagement**. (virtual 2) ★
- Bring **GIT and workgroup presentations to the Advisory Committee meetings**. (14)
- Some partners don't know who, how what the Advisory Committees are. **Allow time for learning** the basics about them. (14)
- **Include Advisory Committees i**n the same briefings that the jurisdictions/CBC get one-on-one. (14)
- **Integrate the Advisory Committee's into the feedback loop** as we are developing draft ideas. (14)
- **Showing up in stakeholder conversations** rather than assuming they want to be engaged in ours. (virtual 2)
- **Look for shared priorities** rather than figuring out how they can support ours. (virtual 2)