

Synthesis – Partnership

P1. Adopt a systems approach to streamline governance and structure:

- P1a. The Steering Committee recommends that the partnership review and revise the Chesapeake Bay Program's governance and structure to reduce complexity and improve adaptive management and decision-making.

Proposed Revisions

- Ensure logical flow in narrative, perhaps more effective if it comes after the recommendations. Make the case in previous recommendations to emphasize governance and structure
- “To” clause, end of recommendation phrasing: reflect purpose / identified needs beyond reducing complexity. Do not pre-emptively constrain review.
 - Some phrasing to improve outcome attainability, or some terminology that gets at action-orientated implementation.
- Consideration on whether “revise” is presumptive. If it is, add “as needed”.
- Accountability could be incorporated; it was a consistent theme in Small Group recommendations.
- Consideration to clarify the who conducts this work. Independent expertise that does organization systems work.

Impact to: Structure, Existing Emphasis, Agreement (specific)

Synthesis – Partnership

P2. Enhance Capacity Building and Technical Assistance through Local Networks:

- P2a. The Steering Committee recommends embracing the Program's role as a network of networks that connects partners with data, tools, resources and technical assistance that build capacity at the local level.

Proposed Revisions

- Consider adding “administrative” with technical assistance.
- Feedback loop aspect of learning from the local level. Not only top-down, but bottom-up.
- Strengthen “embracing” to be a strong action (e.g., “accelerating”, “prioritizing”, “expand its role”)
 - Investing should also be considered to acknowledge existing workloads.
 - Perhaps bring down embrace into enhance (from the Theme).
- Network of Networks – supporting networks, building-up networks. “Network” puts CBP inappropriately as an overarching network.
- Consider the splitting of recommendation statement to utilize different verbs, so that the “connects” action can be a “direction”.

Impact to: Structure, Existing Emphasis, Agreement (specific)

Synthesis – Partnership

P3. Strengthen Diversity, Equity, Inclusion and Justice in the partnership and activate the DEIJ Implementation

Plan:

- P3a. The Steering Committee recommends that the Partnership seek ways in which restoration can be relevant to all communities within the watershed by institutionalizing and actualizing the Program’s Diversity, Equity, Inclusion and Justice Implementation Plan.

Proposed Revisions

- Opportunity for program to clarify its role in community engagement. Reiterating point that CBP is not the “network of networks”.
- Mindful that tribal entities should not be lumped with DEIJ.
- Consideration to explicitly articulate what is meant by DEIJ instead of using the acronym.
- Capture the idea of co-development.
- Articulate what is meant by “relevant to all communities” by writing what communities care about.
 - Restoration may also be confusing / limiting because it is not the only function it performs to improve Bay Health.
- Elevate within the narrative the thought on embracing underserved communities or organizations that represent them.
- Consider improving alignment with theme language (which is narrower) than recommendation.
- Committee and Partnership need to grapple with “activate” considering the lack of implementation. May need a recommendation to evaluate why implementation has failed thus far.

Impact to: Structure, Existing Emphasis, Agreement (specific)

Synthesis – Partnership



P4. Enhance Communications and Transparency to Foster Long-term Success:

- P4a. The Steering Committee recommends prioritizing the Partnership's communications and transparency to drive momentum and ensure long-term efficacy.

Proposed Revisions

- What is the action for achieving this? (e.g. expanding Communication staff; engaging with advisory committees, evaluating information overload). Consider elevating an example from narrative text into the recommendation.
 - Hesitation with “expanding of coordinated communications across state and federal partners to amplify impact” in synthesis.
 - *Limited source material to go off, welcome more source material to better clarify narrative. Coordinated message has been an example of success from another LGAC member observing Great Lakes restoration.*
- Strengthen commitment to transparency, particularly for stakeholders than are unsure of engagement procedures across a range of program activities. Perhaps using term “codifying”.
- Prioritize – unsure on the current level of prioritization and what change is needed. Perhaps “refining” for efficiency and targeting. Perhaps use “improving” instead of prioritizing.
- Possibly combine P2 and P4. Overlap between Network of Networks. Two-way communication mechanism.
 - Another synthesis component could be breaking P4 into two and then recombining. Recognize this is a tied issue.
- Consideration for blending in audience understanding through social science. Also consider the term “facilitate information exchange”.

Impact to: Structure, Existing Emphasis, Agreement (specific)

Synthesis – Restoration and Conservation

R1. Review and refresh existing goals, outcomes and management strategies to more effectively guide the partnership's restoration efforts beyond 2025:

- R1a. The Steering Committee recommends adapting some outcomes to be more compatible with and realistic in the face of anticipated future landscape conditions, accounting for climate and projected land use change.
- R1b. The Steering Committee recommends streamlining the Agreement structure to reduce complexity and improve integration and efficiency of restoration efforts.

Proposed Revisions

- R1a – “Some outcomes” is challenging to interpret. Do not want to state all outcomes, but perhaps something as “as needed” could be used to speak to Phase 2 efforts.
- R1b –
 - Incorporate narrative language to provide an example for “streamlining the agreement”, when Goals/Outcomes are mentioned more in narrative.
 - Only speaks to restoration efforts. Reiterating complexity reduction isn't the only driver of change.
 - TMDL within narrative language – not meant to suggest changing of TMDL, but implementation of TMDL.
- Both –
 - “Review and Refresh”. Use stronger or specific language at outcome/workgroup level, which is already considering needed change. Example of ERG's Outcome vs. Outputs.
 - Two big concepts. Streamlining is fairly similar to the Agreement BLUF.
 - Embed considerations of conservation across all “Restoration” recommendations.
 - Consider incorporating the means of accomplishing this - SRS to conduct reviews was proposed.
- On phrasing overall, use “directive” language for Phase 2 activity. For example, groups will be making a proposal for revisions. Possibly an omission in process that occurs before “review and refresh”.

Impact to: Structure, Existing Emphasis, Agreement (specific)

Synthesis – Restoration and Conservation

R2. Support System-Scale Conservation and Restoration Planning for Vital Habitats:

- R2a. The Steering Committee recommends that conservation should be elevated as a key guiding pillar for the Bay Program, alongside Science, Restoration and Partnership.
- R2b. The Steering Committee recommends prioritizing the restoration of habitats along our tributary rivers and streams, as well as the Bay's nearshore waters— some of the most important places for the people of the watershed and the most productive habitats for our living resources.

Proposed Revisions

- R2a –
 - What does “as a pillar” mean with Conservation? What does it mean to elevate along with Restoration and Science.
 - Restoration implies that it is the only means for living resource and ecosystem health improvements. Conservation is another critical element of activities that would improve living resources and ecosystem health. Conservation as a strategy similar as restoration.
- R2b –
 - Confusion of “along our tributary rivers and streams”. Intent was to capture Shallow Waters Small Group recommendations. Expansion of CESR to not just mean bay-adjacent shallow water, which are not just in marine, tidal systems. Perhaps, replace “prioritizing” with “including”.
 - Wordsmithing – healthy river corridors.
 - Retaining, sustaining, and building – may be implied but could be explicit.
 - Conservation to be included on this line as well.
- Both –
 - “Habitats”...and “Communities”? Theme language envelops people component. Ecosystem services could be a bridge to include people.
 - Does prioritizing mean – system-scale plans for restoration/conservation? Explicitly articulate.

Impact to: Structure, Existing Emphasis, Agreement (specific) - Conservation

Synthesis – Restoration and Conservation



R3. Improve the Program's holistic approach to planning, prioritization, progress-tracking and accountability:

- R3a. The Steering Committee recommends developing and adopting approaches to better incentivize practices that deliver multiple benefits.
- R3b. The Steering Committee recommends enhancing the local benefits of Chesapeake restoration by improving alignment with state and local plans and priorities.
- R3c. The Steering Committee recommends improving progress-tracking and accountability to further support efforts to adaptively manage and better target or prioritize resources and technical assistance.

Proposed Revisions

- R3a –
 - Composite of Clean Water, Shallow Waters, and Climate. Argument that all practices have multiple benefits, so more clarity on the degree of intent of “multiple benefits” is needed. Perhaps clarify the cross-outcome benefit or ecosystem services.
 - Mindful of co-benefits. Sometimes projects can take on too many objectives, and have unintended consequences with overall limited impact to each objective.
- R3b –
- R3c – More context is sought. Incorporated a lot of key ideas that will need to be better articulated. Potentially a need to highlight SRS, but also understand that it is seeking modifications to the accountability framework.
- All – There is much open to interpretation in these recommendations and perhaps its just best to state more explicitly that these concepts require more discussion in Phase 2.

Impact to: Structure, Existing Emphasis, Agreement (specific)

Synthesis – Restoration and Conservation

R4. Build capacity to deliver technical assistance and community engagement through improved coordination and collaboration:

- R4a. The Steering Committee recommends building collective capacity for restoration through improved coordination and collaboration between existing programs, across multiple levels of government, and with new partners.

Proposed Revisions

- Very similar to P2. Are we putting them in both places? Verbiage should be the same if this is true.
- “Consolidation” is coming to mind with terms as “combining”, “leveraging”, etc.
- Structure and Governance is impacted by this recommendation and should be mentioned.
- Another need to add in conservation terminology.

Impact to: Structure, Existing Emphasis, Agreement (specific)

Synthesis – Science

S1. Prioritize research that addresses knowledge gaps in existing and emerging challenges:

- S1a. The Steering Committee recommends prioritizing climate science to enhance understanding of anticipated changes and restoration/conservation practices that can adjust to those changes.
- S1b. The Steering Committee recommends a greater focus on conducting social science research and applying its findings to ensure restoration and conservation efforts align with the well-being of people.

Proposed Revisions

- S1a –
 - Have we missed more changing conditions than climate? Expand to population and land-use change.
 - Consider flow with other science recommendations.
 - A lot is going on, so perhaps synthesizing research instead of “prioritizing” is more appropriate. Related to climate, not social science. Consider explicitly mentioning STAR and STAC for synthesis.
 - Consider mirroring language with how S1b is written.
- S1b –
 - In narrative language, considering this is a non-regulatory document, we should avoid using the term “must” or “shall”.
 - Consider if “the well-being of people” is limiting. Perhaps just end with restoration and conservation efforts.
- Both –

Impact to: Structure, Existing Emphasis, Agreement (specific)

Synthesis – Science

S2. Integrate existing and new science findings in decision making, resource allocation, and communication strategies:

- S2a. The Steering Committee recommends the need to better adapt to these findings and communicate how they are integrated into decision making, resource allocation, and management strategies.
- S2b. The Steering Committee recommends increased efforts to integrating traditional indigenous knowledge and co-producing science with Native nations.

Proposed Revisions

- S2a –
 - Until we see ERG’s revision on science-based decision making, difficult to suggest improvements.
 - “On recent influential studies and reports” – shouldn’t just limit to those reports. Recommendation is about broader synthesis of science and bringing that into our decision-making processes.
 - Stronger language may be needed to “adapt”. “Creating a process” may help explain the action.
- S2b –
 - Confusion on “co-producing science”. Tribes use more eastern science, whereas Bay Program uses more empirical science. Is this a blending of science?
 - Hesitant on taking on tribal engagement without more internal scoping of what the relationship and engagement could be.
 - Would like to see it combined with a Partnership recommendation – understand how tribes would like to be integrated or engaged with the program. Focus on 2nd paragraph of narrative – which is on “strengthening connection of ecosystem...”
- Both –
 - Narrative itself needs more clarity with the findings it’s referring to.

Impact to: Structure, Existing Emphasis, Agreement (specific) - Conservation

Synthesis – Science

S3. Optimize monitoring, modeling, and analysis:

- S3a. The Steering Committee recommends a partnership approach to establish a sustainable, long-term funding plan to maintain critical enhancements in monitoring.
- S3b. The Steering Committee recommends amendments to outcomes require a clear target and development of a monitoring plan because these factors are essential for assessing progress toward a healthy Bay and watershed.
- S3c. The Steering Committee recommends [in addition to CAST] incorporating multiple lines of evidence in the process to evaluate progress towards multiple goals.
- S3d. The Steering Committee recommends that all modeling efforts should integrate climate change projections to better understand changes across multiple indicators and inform strategic planning at the local and state level.
- S3e. The Steering Committee recommends focusing on local scales and analyzing stressor metrics (e.g., toxics, climate change, bacteria) alongside data on the response to the stressor.

Proposed Revisions

- S3a – Need a long-term sustainable funding source for what we do (not just monitoring). If we're mentioning resource needs, it needs to be elevated beyond just monitoring. Omission of purpose of monitoring data.
- S3b – Concerns on the requirement. All outcomes? What is the monitoring requirements for each outcome. Perhaps there is a need to pull into Restoration recommendations.
- S3c -
- S3d – Unsure of its intent. Modeling team is doing this.
- S3e – Questions whether states can do this on their own, or a recommendation to be taken on by the partnership. May go against ERG consideration of doing too many things. From CW recommendation – recognizing local priorities that would benefit the bay. Not a recommendation to take on detailed water quality work.
- All –
 - Recommend that five goes to three (A+B+E) = Monitoring Plan and Funding Needs.
 - Not seeing the difference between new monitoring data and what's existing. Perhaps articulating the need for “ensuring the use of existing monitoring data”. Do not want to insinuate that we need everything ‘new’.
 - Connecting including benefit of multiple outcomes as done Restoration/Conservation.

Impact to: Structure, Existing Emphasis, Agreement (specific) - Conservation

Synthesis – Science

S4. Build Chesapeake Bay Program knowledge and capacity to apply scientific findings:

- S4a. The Steering Committee recommends strengthening its capacity to apply its [wealth of scientific data and] findings effectively.
- S4b. The Steering Committee recommends establishing better access and collaboration [for new tools in development].
- S4c. The Steering Committee recommends expanding its climate science support team and social science staff and dedicate funding for the strategic application of these topics.

Proposed Revisions

- S4a –
 - Recommend to be integrated into Restoration 3a.
- S4b –
 - New tools in development...there are many existing tools and data, so not to lose sight.
 - Better access and collaboration...by whom? Please specify the audience and/or stakeholders.
- S4c –
 - Seems like it overlaps in S4a/b. Doing S4c enables S4a.
 - General re-working of statement to break climate science support team from GITs.
- All – “Scientific findings” in the theme – where are we applying these. Is it everything?

Impact to: Structure, Existing Emphasis, Agreement (specific)