

# BIENNIAL STRATEGY REVIEW SYSTEM

## Chesapeake Bay Program



### Logic and Action Plan: Pre-Quarterly Progress Meeting

**Land Use Options Evaluations – 2018-2019 (some 2019-2020 actions are reflected here additional actions not reflected can be found in the narrative)**

[NOTE: make sure to edit **pre-** or **post-** in the text above, to tell the reader whether this logic and action plan is in preparation for your quarterly progress meeting or has been updated based on discussion at the quarterly progress meeting.]

**Long-term Target:** (the metric for success of Outcome)

**Two-year Target:** (increment of metric for success)

<b>Instructions:</b> Before your quarterly progress meeting, provide the status of individual actions in the table below using this color key.
Action has been completed or is moving forward as planned.
Action has encountered minor obstacles.
Action has not been taken or has encountered a serious barrier.

Additional instructions for completing or updating your logic and action plan can be found on [ChesapeakeDecisions](#).

Factor	Current Efforts	Gap	Actions	Metrics	Expected Response and Application	Learn/Adapt
<i>What is impacting our ability to achieve our outcome?</i>	<i>What current efforts are addressing this factor?</i>	<i>What further efforts or information are needed to fully address this factor?</i>	<i>What actions are essential (to help fill this gap) to achieve our outcome?</i>	<i>What will we measure or observe to determine progress in filling identified gap?</i>	<i>How and when do we expect these actions to address the identified gap? How might that affect our work going forward?</i>	<i>What did we learn from taking this action? How will this lesson impact our work?</i>
<b>Partner Coordination</b>	Work with Land Use Workgroup and Forestry Workgroup on projects and the Land Change Model	Additional capacity, leadership, participation across related outcomes and workgroups	<b>2.1</b> <a href="#">Integrate the results of the GIT FY15/16 (1.2 above) Funding project, “Evaluation of land use policy options, incentives, and</a>	HWGIT staff will keep a log of relevant meetings and actions related to these efforts.	A more coordinated response to shared outcomes.	This outcome requires input and coordination from multiple groups.

			<p><u>planning tools...”</u>  <u>into an agreed upon</u>  <u>location to assist in</u>  <u>outreach on this</u>  <u>topic to local and</u>  <u>state land use</u>  <u>officials.</u></p> <p><b>2.2</b> <u>Link the results</u>  <u>of the Land Use</u>  <u>Methods and</u>  <u>Metrics outcome to</u>  <u>the Land Use</u>  <u>Evaluations</u>  <u>Workplan</u></p> <p><b>2.3</b> <u>Explore the</u>  <u>development and</u>  <u>implementation of a</u>  <u>methodology to</u>  <u>establish climate</u>  <u>related goals and</u>  <u>baseline for</u>  <u>individual</u>  <u>Chesapeake Bay</u>  <u>Agreement</u>  <u>Management</u>  <u>Strategies such as</u>  <u>the Land Use</u>  <u>options Evaluation</u>  <u>Management</u>  <u>Strategy</u></p> <p><b>3.1</b> <u>Review other</u>  <u>local government</u>  <u>outreach related</u>  <u>outcome and actions</u>  <u>items from across</u>  <u>goal teams and work</u>  <u>to assure there is a</u>  <u>coordinated effort to</u>  <u>obtain input from</u>  <u>Local Governments</u>  <u>and Stakeholders</u></p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p><a href="#">4.1 Work collaboratively with Bay Program partners to identify legislative, budgetary and policy needs to advance the goals of the Chesapeake Bay Agreement. We will, in turn, pursue action within our member state General Assemblies and the United States Congress. (Per CBC Resolution #14-1).</a></p>			
<p><b>Technical Understanding</b></p>	<p>FY15 GIT Funding Project – UMD National Center for Smart Growth determined the spectrum of existing policy options, incentives and planning tools currently being implemented at the local and state level</p> <p>HWF-TMDL Project Phase I provided understanding on the monetary benefit and future offset savings of forestland retention HWF-TMDL Project Phase II worked with local officials to develop a toolbox of policy, regulatory, and financial incentives to conserve forests</p>	<p>Need additional understanding on how to effectively engage local governments which will require partner coordination and additional capacity</p>	<p><a href="#">1.1 Conduct a detailed scope of work that includes important considerations, examples, estimated hours, and initial cost estimates to complete this management approach</a></p> <p><a href="#">1.2 Evaluate existing Land Use policy options, incentives, and planning tools to reduce the rate of conversion of agricultural lands, forests, and wetlands</a></p> <p><a href="#">2.2 Link the results of the Land Use Methods and Metrics outcome to the Land Use Evaluations</a></p>	<p>We have developed resources and materials that are useful</p>	<p>Detailed resources available to locals aimed at reducing the rate of farm, forest and wetland conversion.</p>	<p>A report is not enough. We need to determine how best to reach those who need these resources and to package it in a useful way.</p>

<p><b>Education and Outreach: Local and State Governments</b></p>	<p>FY15 GIT Funding Project – UMD National Center for Smart Growth determined existing policy options, incentives and planning tools which could be shared to local governments across the Watershed</p> <p>HWF-TMDL Project Phase III component 1 will create a training on how to implement a toolbox of policy, regulatory, and financial incentives to conserve forests</p>	<p>Local governments need better information on the variety of benefits of land conservation and on the variety of smart growth options</p> <p>Actions, tools, and technical support needed to empower local government and others needs to be compiled, packaged, and provided to our audiences.</p>	<p><u>Workplan</u></p> <p><b>2.1</b> <a href="#">Integrate the results of the GIT FY15/16 (1.2 above) Funding project, “Evaluation of land use policy options, incentives, and planning tools...” into an agreed upon location to assist in outreach on this topic to local and state land use officials.</a></p>			
<p><b>Local Government Agency Engagement</b></p>	<p>HWF-TMDL Project Phase II worked with local officials to develop a toolbox of policy, regulatory, and financial incentives to conserve forests</p>	<p>The level and type of effort varies across the watershed for promoting and implementing smart growth measures.</p> <p>Need to understand local government priorities and what options are most effective for them in order to get buy-in</p>	<p><b>2.1</b> <a href="#">Integrate the results of the GIT FY15/16 (1.2 above) Funding project, “Evaluation of land use policy options, incentives, and planning tools...” into an agreed upon location to assist in outreach on this topic to local and state land use officials.</a></p> <p><b>3.1</b> <a href="#">Review other local government outreach related outcome and actions items from across goal teams and work to assure there is a</a></p>			

			<a href="#">coordinated effort to obtain input from Local Governments and Stakeholders</a>			
<b>Legislative Engagement: Political Challenges</b>	<p>FY15 GIT Funding Project – UMD National Center for Smart Growth determined existing policy options, incentives and planning tools. HWF-TMDL Project Phase II worked with local officials to develop a toolbox of policy, regulatory, and financial incentives to conserve forests. These tools could be shared and implemented in local governments across the Watershed</p> <p>NGO land trust efforts to minimize future land change impacts and increase smart growth</p> <p>TMDL efforts to mitigate future land change impacts to the Bay</p>	Conflicting efforts for local governments	<a href="#">2.1 Integrate the results of the GIT FY15/16 (1.2 above) Funding project. “Evaluation of land use policy options, incentives, and planning tools...” into an agreed upon location to assist in outreach on this topic to local and state land use officials.</a>			
<b>Population Growth: Development</b>	NGO, land trusts, and TMDL efforts to minimize future land change and mitigate impacts to the Bay	Need more incentives like crediting conservation to reduce land conversion to developed and impervious surfaces				
<b>Funding and Finances</b>	GIT Funding (UMD NCSG and VA DOF HWF-TMDL projects)	Are there additional viable funding resources other than GIT funding to create	<a href="#">4.1 Work collaboratively with Bay Program partners to identify</a>			

		increase capacity to achieve Management Approach 2 and 3?	<a href="#">legislative, budgetary and policy needs to advance the goals of the Chesapeake Bay Agreement. We will, in turn, pursue action within our member state General Assemblies and the United States Congress. (Per CBC Resolution #14-1)</a>			
<b>Funding and Finances: Ensure continued affordability of forests, wetlands, and farmland</b>	HWF-TMDL Project Phase III component 2 will create a credit mechanism that encourages optimization of land use planning decisions that conserve natural lands	Need better financial incentives like crediting conservation optimization of land use planning decisions that conserve natural lands				

### ACTIONS – 2018-2019

Action #	Description	Performance Target(s)	Responsible Party (or Parties)	Geographic Location	Expected Timeline
<b>Management Approach 1: Determine the spectrum of existing land use “policy options, incentives, and planning tools” currently being implemented at the local state level</b>					
1.1	Conduct a detailed scope of work that includes important considerations, examples, estimated hours, and initial cost estimates to complete this management approach	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Apply for GIT FY14 Funding</li> <li>2. Awarded contract to Tetra Tech</li> </ol> Finalize draft report	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. HWGIT</li> <li>2. CBT and HWGIT Staff</li> </ol> Tetra Tech, HWGIT Staff	N/A	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Early 2015</li> <li>2. Mid 2015</li> <li>3. Late 2015</li> </ol>
1.2	Evaluate existing Land Use policy options, incentives, and planning tools to reduce the rate of conversion of agricultural lands, forests, and wetlands	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Draft GIT FY15 and FY16 Funding proposals</li> <li>2. Work with awardee to complete policy evaluations as outlined in MS</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. HWGIT Staff</li> <li>2. Contractor</li> <li>3. HWGIT and CBP partner group</li> </ol>	Bay-wide	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. September 2015</li> <li>2. January – December 2016</li> </ol>

## ACTIONS – 2018-2019

Action #	Description	Performance Target(s)	Responsible Party (or Parties)	Geographic Location	Expected Timeline
		3. Review results and evaluate next steps (yellow) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">The Conservation Land Use Policy Toolkit</a> report was completed and placed on the Healthy Watersheds GIT website.</li> <li>• Phase II of the Healthy Watershed Forest Retention Project resulted in a comprehensive “<a href="#">toolbox</a>” of The options focused on developing and implementing solutions to address the barriers and challenges related to conservation.</li> </ul>			3. 2019-20
1.3					
<b>Management Approach 2: Gather, summarize, and place on the Chesapeake Bay Program website (or other locals as determined in the Local Leadership Management Strategy approach for improving transfer of knowledge to locals) existing studies and reports on the costs, benefits, and effectiveness of both local and state level land use “policy options, incentives, and planning tools”.</b>					
2.1	Integrate the results of the GIT FY15/16 (1.2 above) Funding project, “Evaluation of land use policy options, incentives, and planning tools...” into an agreed upon location to assist in outreach on this topic to local and state land use officials	1. Review results and evaluate next steps 2. Work with local leadership group and LGAC to review results and determine the best outreach mechanism	1. HWGIT Staff HWGIT Staff, Local Leadership Workgroup, LGAC, CAC	N/A	1. 2019-20 2. 2019-20
2.2	Link the results of the Land Use Methods and Metrics outcome to the Land Use Evaluations Workplan	1. Work with HWGIT and Land Use Options Evaluations Management Strategy team to link the results of land use methods and metrics analyses and results to determine how best to assist	1. HWGIT, CAC, LGAC, CBP Communications Team, and other CBP partners	N/A	1. 2021 (based on data availability)

## ACTIONS – 2018-2019

Action #	Description	Performance Target(s)	Responsible Party (or Parties)	Geographic Location	Expected Timeline
		communities in reducing the rate of conversion			
2.3	Explore the development and implementation of a methodology to establish climate related goals and baseline for individual Chesapeake Bay Agreement Management Strategies such as the Land Use options Evaluation Management Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Develop suite of climate indicators and prioritize for indicator development.</li> <li>2. Work with the Climate Resiliency Workgroup to understand and apply the results of the project related to the <a href="#">development of climate change indicators and metrics for the Chesapeake Bay</a>.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Climate Resiliency Workgroup, ERG, STAR</li> <li>Climate Resiliency Workgroup, HW GIT and Land Use Options leads</li> </ol>	Bay-wide	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 2018 – 2020</li> <li>2. 2019-2021</li> </ol>
2.4	Create a framework for understanding the links between land conservation and water quality to create “incentives” for localities to reduce conversion and conserve more natural lands.	1. Phase III of the Healthy Watershed Forest Retention project is aimed at working with two VA localities to develop and implement plans, policies and ordinances to foster high quality (HQ) forest and HQ agricultural land retention drawing from the “tool box” of options identified in Phase II. In addition, Phase III will model and pilot long-term funding mechanisms supported by the private sector that may be scaled up and implemented on a landscape scale.	1. HWGIT, Contractor Team		
2.5	Better connect the results of this outcome with the Land Policy BMP Development: CBP GIS team has worked to allow users of the Chesapeake Assessment Scenario Tool (CAST) to calculate changes in	Linking to policy, incentives and planning tools associated with this outcome to the land policy BMPs will serve to better illustrate the potential for planning responses to reduced pollution rates. In addition, it helps to Pollutant loads (pounds of nitrogen, phosphorus, and sediment) from current zoning conditionals as a result of conservation and planning actions.	HWGIT, LUWG, CBP GIS Team, Communications.	CBW (some states have not developed Land Policy BMP scenarios)	2019-2020



## ACTIONS – 2018-2019

Action #	Description	Performance Target(s)	Responsible Party (or Parties)	Geographic Location	Expected Timeline
2.6					
<p><b>Management Approach 3: Survey local governments and interest groups to determine which of the “policy options, incentives and planning tools” implemented at the local or state level have been most effective at reducing land conversion rates; whether the compilation of existing studies and reports on “policy options, incentives and planning tools” placed on the Bay Program website or other location (under the second Management Approach) is sufficient to meet their needs; and if not, what more do they need to achieve a reduction in land conversion rates.</b></p>					
3.1	Review other local government outreach related outcome and actions items from across goal teams and work to assure there is a coordinated effort to obtain input from Local Governments and Stakeholders	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Meet with other GIT staff</li> <li>2. Determine whether some actions can be combined</li> <li>3. Work collaboratively toward multiple actions/outcomes</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. HWGIT and other GIT Staff</li> <li>2. GIT Leadership</li> <li>3. All</li> </ol>	N/A	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Late 2015</li> <li>2. Early 2016</li> <li>3. 2016-2017</li> </ol>
<p><b>Management Approach 4: Use the results of the first three Management Approach tasks to indicate whether additional work is needed to fulfill the evaluation component of this outcome and proceed with the strategy development component of this outcome.</b></p>					
4.1	Work collaboratively with Bay Program partners to identify legislative, budgetary and policy needs to advance the goals of the Chesapeake Bay Agreement. We will, in turn, pursue action within our member state General Assemblies and the United States Congress. (Per CBC Resolution #14-1)	1. Work with GIT to consider policy changes or legislative actions identified by the GIT	1. CBC	1. PA, MD, VA	1. Ongoing