Chesapeake Bay Program
Science. Restoration. Partnership.

I.   Introduction

There are more than 1,800 units of local government in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, and many are already taking steps to restore and protect their local rivers and streams. Additionally, there are more than 600 local conservation and watershed organizations educating and empowering citizens and local leaders to restore and protect local streams and rivers. The Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement acknowledges their important roles and commits to 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.

On December 3, 2014, approximately 60 local appointed and elected officials, senior local government staff, experts in leadership training, and other stakeholders participated in a workshop in Laurel, Maryland. The workshop purpose was to share descriptions of successful watershed protection and restoration efforts, identify gaps in information and resources, and recommend actions to increase the knowledge and capacity of local officials to manage natural resources more effectively.

Local Government Advisory Committee (LGAC) members and other officials participating in the workshop stressed that local officials are diverse in experience, values and agendas; and that the communities they serve vary in resource capacity. Increasing knowledge about the Chesapeake Bay watershed, the complexities of its issues, and relating the value of healthy waters to local priorities such

as land use policies, community health, economic development and tourism will be important to enticing engagement of the uncommitted. Turnover is significant among local officials and key staff in some jurisdictions. This means it will be important to create and nurture a watershed culture of excellence that showcases and promotes local efforts, applauds local initiatives, and provides easy access to action-oriented conservation and restoration models for local officials to adapt and replicate.

This information was instrumental in the development of this Management Strategy, which outlines our plan to achieve the Local Leadership Outcome. It includes developing and expanding training and leadership opportunities, facilitating peer to peer interactions among local officials, improving the availability and accessibility of informational resources, and identifying and improving key sources of information for local leaders.

By working together to engage and facilitate local governments and others, we will leverage resources and ensure better outcomes.

II.   Goal, Outcome and Baseline

This Management Strategy identifies approaches for achieving the following Goal and Outcome:

Stewardship Goal

Increase the number and the 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.

For the purposes of this Management Strategy, the term "local officials" includes elected and appointed officials and senior staff in local government. The term "capacity" is defined as the ability to achieve measureable and sustainable results. Specifically, capacity building refers to enhancing appropriate skills, attitudes, and knowledge to help local officials be more effective in adopting economic and policy incentives while understanding obstacles that inhibit their adoption.

Baseline and Current Condition

According to LGAC members and signatory representatives, local officials' knowledge of watershed issues and capacity to implement watershed restoration and protection initiatives varies quite dramatically throughout the watershed. The Outcome measure has not been developed; therefore, currently there is no identified baseline.

The monitoring and assessing progress sections of this Management Strategy will relate back to these same metrics. The development of this baseline will involve multiple factors, including the knowledge and capacity among local leaders. Measuring knowledge and capacity of local officials is problematic. This might be accomplished by a self-evaluation survey provided to local officials. Given turnover rates

among local officials in some jurisdictions, results would reflect only a moment in time. Public opinion polls may also be a useful tool in determining baseline for knowledge and capacity. The Chesapeake Bay Program is currently funding an effort to explore the development of these metrics.

III.   Participating Partners

Team Lead: Enhance Partnering and Leadership Goal Implementation Team

The following partners have participated in the development of this strategy. A workplan to accompany this Management Strategy will be within one year after this document is finalized. It will identify specific partner commitments for implementing the Strategy.

Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement Signatories and Advisory Committees Participating in Strategy Development
- State of Maryland
- Commonwealth of Virginia
- District of Columbia
- Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
- State of Delaware
- State of West Virginia
- Chesapeake Bay Commission
- US Environmental Protection Agency
- National Oceanographic Atmospheric Administration
- US Army Corps of Engineers
- Fish and Wildlife Service
- Local Government Advisory Committee
- Citizens Advisory Committee

Other Key Participants

The December 2014 Local Leadership Workshop brought together nearly 60 local officials, senior local government program managers and many other stakeholders. Most of the workshop participants agreed to continue to support Outcome development and implementation efforts. A list of December workshop and follow-up meeting participants and the organizations or localities that they represent is listed in Appendix A. This Management Strategy reflects the recommendations of these stakeholders. The workplan will determine the specific actions that signatories and stakeholders will take to implement this strategy for the next two years.

Local Engagement

The success of Chesapeake Bay restoration efforts relies on the ability to increase the knowledge and capacity of local leaders. During the last decade, federal and state regulations were significant in guiding Chesapeake Bay Program efforts. Continued progress in the watershed will depend on voluntary, informed actions by local officials, watershed associations, nongovernmental organizations, grassroots leaders, and individual citizen stewards. Working together to identify specific, critical roles for local

leaders in a culture of mutual respect, and ensuring local knowledge and capacity are sufficient will become increasingly important.

This Outcome and resulting strategy relate to the building of knowledge and capacity of local officials; hence there is a specific, critical role for local government officials and associated local leaders in advising the Goal Implementation Team on Management Strategy development. The Management Strategy includes the recommended actions identified by local officials from across the watershed who participated in the December 2014 workshop and follow-up meetings.

Additionally, watershed associations, nongovernmental organizations, and other community-based and under-represented groups will play critical roles in reaching local officials and building this constituency for conservation action. Therefore, it will continue to be important that actions are compatible and key stakeholders engaged when the Citizen Stewardship and Diversity Management Strategies are implemented.

During the implementation of this strategy, local officials' involvement is important to achieving this Outcome. Remaining involved in advising workplan development and identifying adjustments to our approach is critical. Likewise, participating in the training and peer-to-peer activities, both as leaders and as learners, using the information provided, and continually offering suggestions for improvement are all critical to the success of this Outcome.

IV. Factors Influencing Success

The Chesapeake Bay watershed is vast, its geology complex, and its population diverse.

Local officials differ in recognition of long-term effects of public policy and mirror the range of personal and political goals which characterize the American public. Turnover rates among elected and appointed officials are unpredictable, complicating return on investment from training. Availability of resources - defined as expertise, time, staff and funds - vary widely. Some local officials are technically sophisticated; others do not use technology. Environmental issues are often not routinely addressed in capital planning and annual budgets.

Some local officials are already committed stewards of local resources and the Bay. Others will become committed if they recognize the correlation between local waters, a healthy Bay, and individualized local priorities such as economic development, tourism, and job development. The general electorate, particularly in coastal communities, is becoming more aware of rising sea levels and recurrent flooding, but do not necessarily link those events to environment-related best practices.

The following have been identified as key factors influencing the ability to achieve the Local Leadership Outcome. They are listed, beginning with the most critical factor.

- 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.

V.   Current Efforts and Gaps

Multiple jurisdictions, organizations, and groups of citizens are already working to restore and protect the watershed. In many cases these efforts need to be enhanced, expanded and shared as models with others in the watershed. Examples include:

- Chesapeake Bay Program-funded project by Environmental Leadership Strategies, LLC to identify leadership development programs to determine if and how a local leadership program should be offered through the Bay Program.
- Chesapeake Bay Program-funded project by Tetratech to explore approaches for monitoring progress toward achieving the Outcomes of increased knowledge and capacity for local officials.
- State-by-state outreach, training, and certification via municipal organizations and state associations, state-sponsored training and workshops for stormwater and green infrastructure.
- Environment-focused forums, such as those provided by VACo and MACo.
- Training provided by the Watershed Stewards Academy (WSA), Natural Resources Leadership Institutes (NRLI), and Soil and Water Conservation Districts.
- Peer-to-peer outreach and networking through LGAC, Chesapeake Bay Watershed Forum, Stormwater Partners Retreat, Agricultural Networking Forum, Environmental Finance Workshops, Choose Clean water, and Water Resources Education Network conferences.
- Field opportunities for local officials such as LGAC tours, Chesapeake Bay Foundation's "Farmers to the Bay," and the Allison Ferguson Foundation's meaningful watershed trips.
- Websites and webinars offered by the Bay Program, Chesapeake Stormwater Network, and others.

Gaps

Information and resources are necessary to increase the number of local officials and watershed residents committed to responsible natural resource management. In reviewing current efforts, the following gaps were identified:

- 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.

Actions, Tools and Support to Empower Local Government and Others

Stakeholders identified a variety of actions, tools, and technical support needed to increase knowledge and capacity of local officials. This Management Strategy as a whole addresses these actions, tools, and support. Many are identified in current efforts and gaps.

VI. Management Approaches

In developing the Local Leadership Management Strategy, several approaches were identified as critical to expanding the knowledge and capacity of local officials. These approaches were developed by signatories and a group of local officials and educators. Specific suggestions for programs were provided by local officials and educators that warrant further discussion among stakeholders as to their feasibility and order of priority given the reality of limited resources. Local officials will continue to be engaged in the consideration of specific suggestions during the development of the workplan, which will be completed by April 2016.

The following management approaches set a framework for the Bay Program to identify knowledge and capacity building resources, programs already in place, and opportunities to enhance, expand, or replicate effective programs. In some instances the partnership may consider establishing new programs. Lastly, these management actions should all be considered on a state-by-state and region-by-region basis, given the variety of local needs, priorities and approaches to resources management. In addition, continually increasing the knowledge and capacity may require establishment of a system of learning for local officials.

1. **Develop, enhance and expand training and leadership programs**
   Local leaders have many competing interests vying for their attention and often limited time and resources. Given this situation, it was recognized that training and leadership programs can play a key role in increasing the knowledge and capacity of local government officials to achieve local and

regional goals for environmental conservation and restoration. There is also a constant turnover of local officials throughout the watershed and, hence, a need for training programs to be offered on a recurring basis. Increasing the frequency and consistency of core training on a Bay-wide and regional basis can address the wide disparity in knowledge and capacity that currently exists, as well as provide opportunities to focus on specific region by region complexities and unique solutions to informational needs. These training opportunities can also serve the important role of identifying approaches that address local priorities while improving the local environment, which, in turn, improves the health of the Bay.

To help Bay Program partners, the Enhance Partnering and Leadership Goal Team (Partnering and Leadership Goal Team), and stakeholders determine if, and how, a local leadership program focused on watershed and Bay restoration should be offered, the Chesapeake Bay Program Office funded a project to review leadership programs both in and outside of the watershed. This project, titled, "Assessment of Local Leadership Development Programs," will identify a model that could increase knowledge and capacity of local leaders to take action to support watershed restoration efforts. The results of this project will help the Goal Team and stakeholders further develop this management approach and provide recommendations to be used in the development of the two-year workplan.

To accomplish its objectives, the project has assembled an experienced team to work with the Partnering and Leadership Goal Team, signatories, and other partners to:

■ Identify and interview 20 local leaders within the watershed to understand the areas of greatest concern and identify gaps in knowledge and current leadership training.
■ Develop a list of the top 20 leadership programs for initial review.
■ Evaluate utility and measure effectiveness of the top ten most relevant training and leadership programs to determine whether they address the needs of the Bay Program.
■ Provide three recommendations for local leadership training and an estimated budget for each.
■ Identify a local leadership development program or model that could increase stewardship and watershed restoration efforts.

Based on these recommendations, the Bay Program will work with state, federal and NGO partners to enhance and expand training opportunities through development of a local leadership training program or through existing programs, outreach activities and other mechanisms. Bay Program grants (e.g., local government funding, NFWF) should be considered as potential funding sources.

Additional opportunities to be explored include: a circuit rider for water resources leadership programs; a municipal online training center; adding a citizen stewardship component to existing leadership programs; and development of a core natural resources education curriculum for newly elected leaders.

2. **Increase peer to peer knowledge transfer for local officials**
   Recognizing that many people acquire knowledge directly from their interactions with other individuals, this approach seeks to pair experienced leaders with diverse emerging leaders, or to pair a community which has experienced success with one in the early phase of implementation. Peer-to-peer programs can provide resource recommendations, share lessons learned, and encourage local leaders where the political environment is challenging. To further address resources and

regional complexities, peer-to-peer programs can be delivered in the form of road shows where representatives of successful models travel to other regions of the watershed to focus on a specific solution relevant to the needs of that particular region. Steps to achieve this action may include:

- Review existing local officials' peer-to-peer networking models, both inside and beyond the watershed, and identify lessons learned and areas needing improvement.
- Work with state and NGO partners and LGAC to coordinate and expand existing peer-to-peer forums including evaluating and identifying resource needs.
- Evaluate and catalogue lessons learned and use them to continuously improved peer-to-peer models.
- Tailor messages to local officials, as required.

Additional opportunities to be explored include: Development of a formal peer-to-peer program across jurisdictions; formalize networking within existing technical, professional and volunteer groups; develop metrics to assess benefits of this approach; share recommendations from early adopters with communities willing to do peer-to-peer outreach

3. **Improve transfer of knowledge to locals**
   While there is a lot of available information, local officials express concern that the information is not readily accessible and not in a form that is easy to interpret. This approach addresses the need to improve access to existing information to local officials and members of the public necessary to build community support. This may include expanded availability of online resources. Steps to achieve this action may include:

- Identify communication and outreach methods used by states, federal agencies, and NGOs to reach local officials.
- Determine ways to enhance and improve these approaches.
- Establish best practices for providing information to less engaged communities.
- Periodically review and continually improve these approaches based upon needs of local officials.
- Assure that information is delivered in a way that is relevant and clear to local officials.

Additional opportunities to be explored include: Increase collaboration regionally; provide funding for municipal and regional visioning sessions; identify local organizations to assist with knowledge transfer; identify techniques to address knowledge gaps; establish teaching/training relationships with universities and community colleges.

4. **Identify and improve key knowledge and information sources**
   Local officials' information needs differ from those of the general public or the scientific community. Development of key information sources will be created as part of this approach. Additionally, this approach will address modifying similar messages for different audiences in order to build community support and address political obstacles perceived by local decision makers. This approach addresses the need for messaging targeted to local officials. While messages for local officials and the general public may be similar, content tone and presentation should be distinct. Local officials need to know what is proposed or required, resources provided, deadlines,

responsibilities, and how actions will support local priorities. Effective public communication is clear, brief and contextual; addresses obstacles perceived by local leaders; and builds community support.

Steps to achieve this action may include:

- Identify and prioritize types of information and information sources beneficial to local officials from their perspectives, such as flooding resiliency, land use policies that promote sustainable development, community benefits from stormwater management, and cost-benefits of green canopy.
- Deliver the information in a manner that is collegial, clear, and relevant.
- Continuously evaluate communications from the perspective of the message intended versus the message as it was received.
- Identify cost effective approaches, specifically approaches that prioritize a higher ease of implementation.

Additional opportunities to be explored include: News releases targeted to local officials; case studies of economic justifications for restoration; information related to the activities of state and local governments to meet the TMDL and other Bay restoration requirements.

Cross-Outcome Collaboration and Multiple Benefits

The Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement is complex with intersecting Goals and Outcomes. To establish a culture of excellence across the watershed, the Local Leadership Outcome depends on the achievement of other Outcomes, including Citizen Stewardship, Diversity, and Environmental Literacy. Local officials react to the needs of their diverse constituents, so a culture of stewardship at the grassroots level is also important to the success of this Outcome. An environmentally literate electorate can help drive the success of increasing citizen stewardship and engaging local leaders.

Many other Goals and Outcomes, including Outcomes for the Urban Tree Canopy, Water Quality, and Land Use Options and Evaluation, among other Outcomes, rely on local implementation of actions and increased knowledge and capacity of local officials. When a strong culture of excellence in natural resource management exists among local officials, it will provide the framework for action necessary to achieve the vision articulated in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement. Therefore, the Partnering and Leadership Goal Team is cross-collaborating with the following Goals Teams that are responsible for Outcomes that depend on strong local leaders:

- Sustainable Fisheries Goal Team (Oyster Outcome)
- Protect and Restore Vital Habitats Goal Team (SAV Outcome)
- Protect and Restore Water Quality Goal Team (2017 WIP, 2025 WIP Outcomes, Urban Tree Canopy and Riparian Forest Buffer Outcomes)
- Maintain Healthy Watersheds Goal Team (Land Use Methods and Metrics Outcome, Healthy Waters Outcome)
- Foster Chesapeake Stewardship Goal Team (Citizen Stewardship Outcome, Environmental Literacy Outcome, Public Access Outcome, Land Conservation Outcome)
- Diversity Action Team Goal Team (Diversity Outcome)

Information and resources are necessary to close the gap and increase the number of local officials and watershed residents committed to responsible natural resource management. In order to support conservation actions, and accept responsibility for implementation, local officials need to possess at least a basic understanding of key environmental issues and concepts. There are several Management Strategies that identify the need to increase local officials' knowledge as being necessary to achieve their desired Outcome. Steps to achieve this action may include:

- Coordinate development of two-year workplans for Citizen Stewardship, Diversity, and Environmental Literacy with the Local Leadership Management Strategy to ensure actions are complementary.
- Review other Management Strategies for opportunities to engage local officials increase their capacity to achieve, as appropriate.
- Periodically assess Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement Goals to identify information sharing and knowledge transfer needs.
- Incorporate results into the two-year workplans.

Approaches Targeted to Local Participation

All of the approaches cited above are intended to facilitate local participation and develop local leaders who can participate more fully in implementing the Management Strategies. To facilitate greater local participation from under-served and under-represented communities, the Local Leadership Workgroup will work closely with the Diversity Action Team to identify non-traditional partners and conduits for achieving the Outcome. Additional actions, tools, or technical support needed to empower local governments to participate in achieving the Outcome will be identified in the workplan.

VII. Monitoring Progress

As we begin to develop the workplan and implement key actions, a baseline and success criteria will be established and metrics developed to determine progress. Making this information available to a diversity of constituents, especially those at the community level, will prepare groups and individuals to understand where there is a need to encourage policy change. (The following tools and resources have been identified to assist in progress monitoring.)

- Utilize surveying instruments such as before and after training surveys.
- Explore innovate approaches to gain baseline data (e.g. trivia contests, games, creative phone apps).
- Consider basic tracking using number of contacts and meetings.
- Utilize social network diagrams technique and social media for determining progress.
- Track the number of people going through the leadership academies.
- Use the Chesapeake Stormwater Network annual survey of members to assess programming.
- Determine the different mechanisms for the different categories of local officials (e.g., elected versus senior staff).
- Count how many exchanges occur, commitments made, and commitments completed.
- Count the number of municipalities that have built-in requirements for certification or training.
- Track the number of local officials and mentors participating in a mentoring program and track how many maintain their relationships.

- 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.
- Use existing research that measures local knowledge base.
- Review metrics used by local leadership programs to determine success.

VIII. Assessing Progress

Progress in the building of knowledge and capacity in local officials will be assessed every two years. At the December workshop, many officials agreed to participate in this initial effort to determine success factors and develop progress criteria. Hence direct participation with localities continues.

Throughout the initial assessment period, local officials will be a part of the process to determine how progress is determined including criteria, scope, scale and adaptive management techniques utilized. It is anticipated that this strategy may require one or more two-year cycles to fully determine whether the initial effort has been successful.

IX. Adaptively Managing

Following the first two-year review period and based on the information obtained through surveys and other assessment criteria, programmatic changes will occur. The purpose will be to maximize the effectiveness of the methods utilized for local leadership knowledge and capacity building and achieve program success.

X. Biennial Workplan

This Management Strategy outlines the approach the Chesapeake Bay Program Partners will be taking between now and 2025. Biennial workplans, focusing on the priorities and resources available to all participating signatories and partners for the following two years will be developed for each Management Strategy by April 2016. The Local Leadership workplan is expected to include the following information:

- Key actions
- Timeline for each action
- Expected outcomes
- Partners responsible for each action
- Estimated resources required

Throughout the workplan and its implementation, there will be targeted outreach to township, municipal and county associations, and other groups as they are identified.

Appendix A

The following is a list of the individuals who have participated in the development of this Management Strategy through input at stakeholder meetings.

1. Randy Bartlett, Fairfax Department of Public Works and Environmental Services
2. Don Baugh, Chesapeake Bay Commission
3. Chris Beacraft, MD Department of Natural Resources
4. Gem Bingol, Piedmont Environmental Council
5. Carin Bisland, EPA Chesapeake Bay Program Office
6. Jessica Blackburn, Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay and Chesapeake Bay Citizens Advisory Committee Coordinator
7. Heidi Bonnaffon, Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments
8. Bevin Buchheister, Chesapeake Bay Commission
9. Janine Burns, Mathews County, VA Supervisor and Chesapeake Bay Local Government Advisory Committee Chair
10. Dennis Buttorf, Jersey Shore, PA Mayor
11. Jim Caldwell, Howard County Office of Environmental Sustainability
12. Trish Carothers, Susquehanna Greenway Partnership
13. Mark Charles, City of Rockville, MD
14. Alexandra Chiaruttini, Stock and Leader, Attorneys at Law
15. Sandy Coyman, Talbot County, MD Department of Planning (retired)
16. Meo Curtis, Montgomery County, MD Department of Environmental Protection
17. Philip Cwiek, US Army Corps of Engineers
18. Diane Davis, DC Department of the Environment
19. Jacob Day, Salisbury, MD City Council President
20. Nissa Dean, Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay
21. Nick DiPasquale, EPA Chesapeake Bay Program Office
22. Lindsay Dodd, DE-MD Agribusiness Association
23. Deborah Ealer, North Middleton Township, PA Township Manager
24. Suzanne Etgen, Watershed Stewards Academy
25. Greg Evans, VA Dept. of Agriculture and Forestry
26. Andy Fellows, College Park, MD Mayor
27. Erik Fisher, Chesapeake Bay Foundation
28. Mike Foreman, VA Department of Recreation and Conservation
29. Kathleen Freeman, Caroline County, MD Department of Planning, Codes, & Engineering
30. Kate Fritz, South River Federation
31. Jack Frye, Chesapeake Bay Commission
32. Mary Gattis, Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay and Local Government Advisory Committee Coordinator
33. Alan Girard, Chesapeake Bay Foundation
34. Jacqueline Goodall, Forest Heights, MD Mayor
35. Norman Goulet, Northern Virginia Regional Commission

36. Leslie Grunden, Caroline County, MD Department of Planning, Codes, & Engineering
37. Joe Grzeika, King George County, VA Board Member
38. Peter Hill, DC Department of the Environment
39. Ruth Hocker, Lancaster, PA Director of Public Works
40. Steve Hubble, Stafford County, VA Department of Public Works
41. Elizabeth Johnson, Middle Peninsula Planning District Commission
42. Charlotte Katzenmoyer, Lancaster, PA Director of Public Works
43. Donnelle Keech, The Nature Conservancy
44. Les Knapp, Maryland Association of Counties
45. Ed Knittel, PA State Association of Boroughs
46. Larry Land, Virginia Association of Counties
47. Ernie Lehman, North Old Town Independent Citizens Civic Association (Alexandria, VA)
48. Megan Lehman, Lycoming County, PA Department of Planning and Community Development
49. Joe Lerch, VA Municipal League
50. Rhonda Manning, PA Department of Environmental Protection
51. Stuart McKenzie, Northern Neck Planning District
52. Erik Michelson, Anne Arundel County, MD Department of Public Works
53. Shannon Moore, Frederick County, MD Sustainability and Environmental Resources
54. Ellen Moyer, Former Mayor of Annapolis, MD and Former Chair of Chesapeake Bay Local Government Advisory Committee
55. Jennifer Nelson, Sussex Conservation District (DE)
56. Nancy Nunn, Harry H. Hughes Center for Agro-Ecology
57. Sammy Orlando, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
58. Reggie Parrish, EPA Chesapeake Bay Program Office
59. Matthew Pennington, WV Eastern Panhandle Planning and Development Council
60. Julie Pippel, Washington County, MD Division of Environmental Management Director
61. Gwyn Rowland, Susquehanna River Basin Commission
62. Matt Royer, Penn State Agriculture ad Environment Center
63. Steven Saari, DC Department of the Environment
64. Paul Santay, Stafford County, VA Department of Public Works
65. James Shallenberger, Susquehanna River Basin Commission
66. Pam Shellenberger, PA Chapter of the American Planning Association
67. Tanya Spano, Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments
68. Phillip Stafford ,MD Department of Natural Resources
69. Charlie Stek, Chesapeake Bay Citizens Advisory Committee Chair
70. Christopher Thompson, Lancaster County, PA Conservation District
71. Joanne Throwe, Environmental Finance Center
72. Jennifer Walls, DE Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control
73. Wendy Walsh, Tioga County, NY Soil and Water Conservation District
74. Tim Ware, George Washington Regional Commission
75. Matt Weir, Derry Township, PA Supervisor
76. James Wheeler, PA State Association of Township Supervisors
77. Julie Winters, EPA Chesapeake Bay Program Office