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Introduction

Leadership is a process that occurs in many arenas; it may be emerge in a large group, a small group, a profit organization, a non-profit organization, a social movement, a citizen's group, or in many other situations. This project will focus on leadership within smaller citizen groups in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed. The goal of this project is to study Chesapeake Bay Watershed Associations and determine the best practices of leadership that the citizen leaders of these organizations have used. The present literature on nonprofit organizations and citizen leadership will be used as guidance and criteria for the best practices of leadership in the watershed associations.

There are many watershed associations such as the James River Association or the Chickahominy Watershed Alliance throughout the Chesapeake Bay Watershed, but it is unclear how these organizations function and what makes one more effective than another. I have evaluated these organizations through surveys and interviews in an attempt to develop a guideline of leadership best practices of these various organizations. After this initial evaluation was completed, I analyzed the leadership styles of leaders within certain organizations and the leadership that each of these individuals offered their surrounding community. The ultimate goal of this project is to determine some of the better methods and innovative ideas of citizen leadership used by members of the watershed organizations in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed. The results of this research will be used as my senior project report, as a report to the EPA Chesapeake Bay Program, and in a brochure for a watershed association conference in the late spring.

This project is one that I began as an intern with the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay this summer and have continued as my senior project. The Alliance
received a grant from the EPA to develop and facilitate a survey of watershed associations in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed. The associations may vary in membership size from as small as 15 members to 100 members, but they are all citizen led groups with the purpose of protecting a creek, river, stream, or the Bay. This summer, I constructed and administered a mail survey as part of my internship. In the fall, the results were tallied and analyzed with government computers at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) office. The Alliance was then interested in doing interviews with some of the organizations to gain more insight and detail about the workings of watershed organizations. As an intern I interviewed these organizations to learn their stories and gain a better understanding of their successes and failures. I enhanced my work by taking the project one step further and analyzing the leadership styles of the leaders within the organizations to develop an understanding of the best practices and highly effective procedures that led to excellent leadership of Chesapeake Bay watershed associations.

I believed that the success of these organizations went beyond good management skills and enthusiastic volunteers. I believe that leadership is the key to understanding these organizations. Organizations do not succeed or fail on the basis of their structure or culture, but rather their success depends on the process called leadership which combines the elements of the leader, followers, and situation. The Alliance and the Bay Program hope to discover how they can better assist the watershed associations; I do not believe that they can find the answer to this question unless they analyze the leadership of the organizations, not the individual variables which factor into the organization. Thus, I interviewed and analyzed these organizations with a particular eye to the citizen leaders in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed. With this type of analysis, I think the final product contains a much better analysis rather than a guide of effective watershed organizations.
I expected that concepts from classes in leadership in community organizations and leadership in social movements would be most useful in this project. More specifically, I expected that issues such as group formation and development, and nonprofit leadership would be most helpful. In actuality, the concept of citizen leadership and servant leadership became the most important topic when I examined the watershed associations.
Literature Review

Before analyzing the leadership of Chesapeake Bay watershed associations, I needed to conduct a review of the available literature on the structure and management of community and nonprofit organizations, leadership within community and nonprofit organizations, and other theories of leadership in relation to grassroots efforts such as citizen leadership and servant leadership.

Management of Nonprofit and Community Organizations

The Guide to Nonprofit Management by Smith, Bucklin, and Associates outlines the crucial characteristics of nonprofit organizations. As the basic foundation of any nonprofit organization, there must be direction and strategic planning, strong board/staff relations, and effective funding (xix). According to Smith, the establishment of a mission statement and strategic planning is critical to the success of a nonprofit organization; "rather than waiting for that crisis, leaders of nonprofit organizations must think strategically, continually analyzing emerging trends affecting their organization" (1). As a guideline for effective planning, Smith suggests observing if these organizations have "obtained support and commitment from elected leaders to pursue strategic planning, ... involved leadership and staff, ... obtained assistance from a person outside the organization, ... conducted an environmental analysis, ... planned and conducted a strategic planning session, ... established a process for implementing the strategic plan, ... and documented the process" (28). These guidelines can be used as criteria in determining the best practices of the watershed associations.

Once the organization has begun to develop a mission statement and strategic plan, a smooth relationship between board and staff needs to be nurtured. Smith emphasizes that it is critically important for nonprofit organizations to understand the role of both the board of directors and the staff. Smith offers the following questions to help the reader identify whether the two groups are functioning smoothly within the
organization: has the organization "established a policies and procedures manual, ... developed a new board orientation program, ... established effective communication systems of interactions between and among board, staff, committees, and constituents, ... and provided opportunities for informal interactions of board and staff?" (59). If the watershed associations have a board of directors then these questions should be helpful indicators. Smith concluded the discussion of basic foundations of nonprofit organizations by outlining several critical steps in the formation of a successful fundraising plan.

Yet once the foundation of the organization is stable, it is also necessary for the leaders of the organization to create a market orientation, provide educational programs, effectively run meetings, use public relation tools, and obtain political support (xx-xxi). The Complete Guide to Nonprofit Management provides a clear understanding of the basic structure and necessary variables within a nonprofit organization which may occur in the watershed association.

According to Jacquelyn Woolf in "Managing Change in Nonprofit Organizations," there are five unique characteristics of a nonprofit organization: its nonprofit nature, breadth of purpose, demanding environment, volunteer-staff mix, and mixed structure (242-3). Woolf explained that change within any organization, but particularly nonprofit organizations, is inevitable; it is equally important for managers to observe and recognize the influence of the unique characteristics of nonprofit organizations on organizational change. There are many factors such as competition, resentment, past failures, etc. which play into organization's change and its effectiveness, but nothing is as important as the manager who is able handle this change. Woolf argues that change is "unavoidable" and the manager who can use "vision, commitment, maturity, sensitivity, inclusiveness, and an action orientation" will be more inclined to lead an organization through the turbulent times of change (256). This literature suggests that the leader who is able to handle change will lead
the organization more successfully. This is a trend that I expected to witness in the watershed associations.

Other literature directly related to the management of nonprofit organization generally tends to coincide with the theories and philosophies espoused by the previous literature. Authors such as James P. Gelatt, Brian O'Connell, Si Kahn and Lakey et al also describes the fundamentals of managing a nonprofit organization from board staff relations to mission statements and strategic planning to fundraising efforts to volunteer recruitment. Thus, it is crucial to understand the basic functioning of nonprofit organizations before one can immediately begin analyzing the leadership within the organization.

**Ten Lessons of Leadership**

Before focusing on any specific theories of leadership, Barry Posner and James Kouzes in "Ten Lessons for Leaders and Leadership Developers" offer ten excellent lessons of leadership that can be applied to any type of organization. They analyzed thousands of cases and surveys to develop a concept of "exemplary leadership practices and fundamental constituent expectations" (3). The following are their ten lessons of leadership.

1. Challenge provides the opportunity for greatness- in leading and in learning to lead.
2. Leadership is in the eye of the beholder.
3. Credibility is the foundation of leadership.
4. The ability to inspire a shared vision differentiates leaders from other credible sources.
5. Without trust, you cannot lead.
6. Shared values make a critical difference in the quality of life at home and at work.
7. Leaders are role models for their constituents.
8. Lasting change progresses one hop at a time.
9. Leadership development is self-development.
10. Leadership is not an affair of the head. It is an affair of the heart (4-9).
These lessons are critical observations which one might hope to also observe in the watershed organizations. It is not expected that each organization will not reflect every lesson here, but hopefully that the organizations with the stronger leadership will reflect more of these lessons than the others. Since I eventually developed a list of leadership lessons from the watershed organizations, it is helpful to have a guideline like Posner and Kouzes'.

**Leadership Theories in Community and Nonprofit Organizations**

Once, the foundation and structure of the community and nonprofit organizations have been explained and understood, it is crucial to begin analyzing various leadership theories and determine whether they apply to the scenarios at hand or not.

There is much to study about leadership within a structured environmental nonprofit organization. Joseph C. Santora and James C. Sarros tackled the issues of leadership in executive directors in their article "Executive Leadership: Responding to Change." As Woolf suggested earlier, organizational change is inevitable; Santora and Sarros suggest that "executive leadership does matter for continued organizational longevity as well as for the development and empowerment of employees" (62). Santora and Sarros studied a nonprofit organization and discovered that the executive director served as a change agent and helped the organization grow throughout three decades of turbulence. The successful organizational leader must "scan the environment, anticipate needed change in organizational strategy and structure, and then effectively implement the needed changes" (66). It remains to be seen whether the leaders of the Chesapeake Bay watershed associations are effective change agent leaders or not.

In attempting to distinguish among these watershed organizations, it is helpful to have indicators such as the previous authors have provided. Knauff, Berger, and
Gray in Profiles of Excellence have developed four hallmarks of excellence. Effective nonprofit organizations have all of the following:

1. A clearly articulated sense of mission that serves as the focal point of commitment for board and staff and is the guideline post by which the organization judges its successes and makes adjustments in the course over time.

2. An individual who truly leads the organization and creates a culture that enables and motivates the organization to fulfill its mission.

3. An involved and committed volunteer board that relates dynamically with the chief staff officer and provided a bridge to the larger community.

4. An ongoing capacity to attract sufficient financial and human resources.

These hallmarks of excellence support many of the earlier ideas posed by Smith and other nonprofit authors yet Knauft's literature is even more significant because they also chose to emphasize effective leadership when discussing nonprofit management. Knauft et al concentrated on nonprofit management as the other authors did, but added an additional element of focus and importance: leadership!

When Knauft et al analyzed the leadership of the organization, they chose to focus on the role of the executive director as a leader. Accordingly, the best leaders:

have clear goals and a vision to look beyond ... the immediate horizon, exhibit a willingness to stand up and be shot at, have the courage to make extremely tough decisions, understand their constituent's motivation and identify immediately with their needs and concerns, and exhibit a special presence that enables them to motivate and inspire their constituents, staff, and volunteers beyond the authority conferred by a title.

Knauft distinguished between good managers and good leaders by their set of leadership traits. Leaders are mission directed, have vast amounts of energy and concentration, act as motivators, measure success according to the organization, are
articulate and good listeners, have "people sense," and are creative thinkers (11-13). Again all of the watershed association leaders may not have these characteristics, but the more effective leaders should exemplify some of these traits.

Community Centered Leadership Organizations

Kristin Kroll and Lela Vanderberg emphasize the importance of servant leadership and community centered organizational leadership in their article "Community Centered Organizational Leadership: Challenges for Practice." They argue that "a 'leaderful' organizational culture [is] characterized by shared leadership roles and responsibilities, a strong organizational identity centered in a shared vision, and a healthy sense of community" (118). In fact, they explained that the leaders of such a culture are also "excellent community builders," transformational leaders, and servant leaders (118). Community centered organizational leadership is a theory that should work in any organization, but should be especially successful in organizations where the followers are few and are in need of motivation to continue on in their difficult endeavors.

One example of a community centered organization is Food for the Hungry/Kenya. Kroll and Vanderberg discovered three key elements that made FH/K such an exceptional community centered organization:

First, its organizational identity and vision was owned by all staff members, whose commitment arose from a sense of personal calling. Second, its commitment to shared leadership and servanthood resulted in widely distributed responsibilities and attitudes modeled after Christ. Third, the leader of FH/K was a model servant and transformational leader (120).

As many of the earlier authors, like Kroll and Vanderberg with the example of the TH/K, have noted, the organization and its leaders must be able to guide themselves through change. Kroll and Vanderberg also cite Margaret Wheatley when explaining that any learning organization needs an identity that is "adaptive,
intelligent, and able to respond quickly to the changing needs of those it serves" (120). The authors added that the constituents of this organization need to have a sense of ownership over the organizational identity and vision for them to maintain a commitment to the organization and its mission.

Kroll and Vanderberg also place a heavy emphasis on shared leadership and servant leadership. For watershed associations with a membership of concerned citizens, it seems especially critical that the organizations place an emphasis on shared leadership. "Leadership is not vested in any one person, but rather is distributed throughout the organization" (121). The goal should be to develop an organization that is a "community of practice" where "people are joined in a common endeavor who share a commitment to mission, vision, and values, and to each other" (121). According to the authors, servant leadership is key to the success of shared leadership. A servant leader should have these ten characteristics: listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and the ability to build community (122). Watershed associations are dealing with problems that are close to people's personal lives and residences; a community centered organizational leadership practice with a focus on servant leadership should benefit the watershed association members by giving them a sense of ownership and influence over the immediate problems at hand. The authors have provided us with several themes like community and servant leadership to hopefully observe in the watershed association.

Community Visioning

In "Community Visioning and Leadership," Don Bargen stated that community visioning "is the process of effectively stating what we, as a community, really want to be" in order to develop healthy and strong communities (135). Visioning:
• identifies what we, as a community want to be known for (e.g. mining, agriculture, tourism)
• describes how well we will choose to treat one another
• explains how power will be experienced among us (139).

Community visioning occurs in "the context of uncertain membership, lack of clear lines of authority, and extreme diversity" (139); these are the challenges to community visioning. In order to develop a shared vision, there are three major steps that must be taken: create the shared vision, achieve the shared vision, and live the shared vision (141). Within this process, the leader will have to generate hope, mediate conflict, name reality, coordinate resources, evaluate, and celebrate. These three steps of visioning affect the leader and their success in achieving a community vision with the other members of the community.

Community visioning is significant to watershed associations, because if they are able to develop and implement it correctly then "leaders and followers have come to serve one another in different roles" (158). Community visioning is a tool of leadership that these watershed associations should develop to better determine the needs of their community. Bargen explained that by implementing shared visions, leadership is developed; "it is the people of the community whom the leaders serve who empower them as leaders ... the community enables leaders to lead, and the people themselves become effective as followers" (158). Through community visioning, hopefully the community has a better sense of what it wants and at the same time new leaders are being developed as the process continues. It will be significant to note whether the watershed associations have active visioning in their organizations.

Citizen Leadership and Servant Leadership

Richard Couto introduced us to the theory of citizen leadership where citizens confront problems together and develop solutions to these situations. According to Couto, citizen leadership occurs "when people take sustained action to bring about
change that will permit them continued or increased well being" (12). The citizen leader is one who did not choose leadership, but rather someone who sees a problem and attempts to solve it and through the process becomes the leader of the situation. These individuals "do not become involved with the intention of staying," but the leadership quickly "brings new responsibilities, new contacts, media exposure, and the other trappings of leadership" (13). Instead of the traditional political or business leader, the citizen leader "speaks in simple terms about the basic dignity of every human being" (15) and the driving force of every citizen leader is the needs of their community. Citizen leadership at its best "protects and mitigates the shortcomings of our national and political leadership" (17). Most of the watershed associations are led primarily by citizens and Couto offers us some thoughts on the role of leadership in community organizations.

Elkin Terry Jack in "Philosophical Foundation of Citizen Leadership" embraces the notion of citizen leadership and argues that this type of leadership is often missing in today's problems. Citizen leadership "is not the type of leadership where someone says 'I want to lead masses of people.' It involves people who already have the skills and qualities of a leaders, but who do not seek leadership - it seeks them" (56). This citizen leader is most likely the type of leader who will evolve in the smaller grassroots watershed organizations rather than in the larger structured nonprofit organizations. Effective leadership should involve "an educated, concerned, and involved citizenry that willingly gives direction to office holders" (57). Jack explained that the importance of citizen leadership lies in the concept of people solving their own problems. In environmental concerns and issues it seems probable that the watershed organizations with the strongest leadership will be "'responsive' to 'someone in need'" (60).

In a later article "Learning to Speak the Language of Citizen Leadership," Elkin Terry Jack explained that "community problem solving, directed by citizen leaders is
an art," and highlighted the eight aspects of successful citizen leadership. The following are the arts of citizen leadership:

1. Active Listening
2. Creative Conflict (an environment safe for differences)
3. Mediation (reducing unproductive conflict, while enhancing mutual respect)
4. Negotiation
5. Political Imagination (avoid cynicism and naivety)
6. Public Talk (successfully engage in public dialogue)
7. Public Judgment
8. Reflection (review learned lessons after each experience) (113-114).

The watershed associations with innovative leadership practice some of the "arts" and exemplify the characteristics which Couto and Jack described.

Cheryl Mabey in her article "Making of a Citizen Leader" explained that citizen leadership is possible "if citizens develop the abilities to gain access to information of all kinds and the skills to put such information to effective use" (314). Mabey also noted that citizen leaders will "need to recognize and understand the certain restraining forces in the world as it is" (315). I expect that many of the citizen leaders in the watershed associations will have difficulty grasping with the external forces that make their jobs so difficult. I am also curious to learn if the leaders have developed skills and abilities they did not have earlier.

Citizen leadership also entails an element of service to the community. Robert Greenleaf developed a theory of servant leadership in which the "great leader is seen as servant first." (19). The crux of servant leadership is that the individual began his or her work in service to others and through that role in service, he or she eventually developed into a leader. The importance here is that "one wants to serve first. Then conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead. That person is sharply different from one who is leader first" (22). I expect that the individuals who are leading the
watershed associations actually began once as servants to their community and later blossomed into leaders of their community.

The Literature in Sum

With a grasp of the structure of community organizations, leadership theories can be applied to the specific context of Chesapeake Bay watershed associations. Through my data collection and analysis I have been able to determine whether these watershed associations reflect the various theories of leadership I have reviewed.

The literature offered some major themes to look for in the watershed associations. The management theories stressed the importance of mission statements, strategic planning, board/staff relations, fundraising, and volunteer recruitment. The management literature also stressed the inevitability of change and the importance of managing it well. The ten lessons of Posner and Kouzes should be helpful in developing a concept and theory of best practices in community organizations. The community organization leadership literature emphasized the importance of handling change along with the significance of mission and vision, an involved board, leaders, and human and financial resources. The community centered leadership organization leadership stressed the importance of shared roles, responsibilities, and vision. In addition, servanthood in these types of organizations is critical to the development of leadership and ownership of the problems. The community visioning literature emphasized visioning as a necessary tool which identifies, describes, and explains. Finally, the citizen and servant leadership literature offered a preview of the issues which might develop in the citizen leaders of these organizations.

The interviews I have conducted suggest that the concept of citizen leadership is occurring regularly in these organizations. Larger community organization leadership concepts have not been as prevalent. Many of these individuals possess some of the traits outlined by the literature, but not all of the traits. In addition, many of the
organizations are not very structured and do not have the stability and foundation that the organizations so need. The one characteristic that all of the watershed association leaders need to posses is the ability to vision and has a sense of the larger issues and a plan for where they wish to see the organization go.
Methodology

This project consisted of several steps of data collection and analysis. The first step of the project consisted of a mail survey that I drafted for the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay in conjunction with the EPA Chesapeake Bay Program in August 1996 and distributed in September. The survey was a four-page document designed to determine the structure of watershed organizations in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed. The survey (see Appendix A) consisted primarily of closed-ended questions beginning with questions about membership and organizational structure and logistics. The primary focus of the survey was developed in the next section of the questions which examined the issues or activities that these organizations were actively involved with or still gaining information about. Through this section we hoped to gauge the primary differences between the organizations by their varying levels of involvement in restoration and monitoring activities, outreach and education, political issues, planning and land use issues, pollution prevention issues, energy efficient issues, or economic issues. The final closed ended questions evaluated the organization's relationship with the government and funding sources. In an attempt to gather more personal accounts of the watershed organizations there were some short answer questions about accomplishments, frustrations, and probable interest in a regional watershed organization meeting. The survey was mailed to over 200 organizations with a self addressed stamped envelope. We received about 63 replies which is actually very strong considering past attempts to interview the same constituency. The results of the survey were later used to develop the list of the organizations contacted for interviews and some of the interview discussion topics.

The surveys were returned over the fall to the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay. Then the results were tallied by the NOAA on their database system (Microsoft Excel) to allow for easier access to specific information (i.e., if someone wanted to know which organizations were involved with stormwater pollution prevention they could
easily obtain that information from the NOAA database rather than receiving the results of all of the surveys). At the end of January, the Alliance received the results from the NOAA office and the development of questions for the phone interviews began.

Phone interviews were used to gather the new data and more personal accounts of the watershed organizations. The Executive Director of the Alliance and I determined which organizations seemed like probable candidates for a follow-up interview due to their answers on the survey, particularly the question of whether they would be willing to speak with someone from the Alliance or the Bay Program. The goal was to complete at least 21 interviews with seven from every state (Maryland, Virginia, and Pennsylvania). We developed a list of topics and some guideline questions which were used to learn more detailed information about the organizations (see Appendix B).

I began conducting the phone interviews at the end of February from the Richmond Alliance office on Tuesdays and Thursdays. If watershed organizations were unavailable at this time, then the other interviews were completed from my residence. The phone interviews lasted approximately 20-30 minutes and provided us with a much more detailed understanding of the history of the organization, the coverage (meaning whether their interest is a stream, river, watershed, etc.), membership development, depth of involvement in the issues, and other questions about leadership, outreach, successes, frustrations and more. The interviews were not recorded because the Alliance does not have the equipment to do so nor did the Executive Director feel comfortable doing so. The success of the interview information relied on my ability to take thorough notes while interviewing and to quickly transpose these notes after each interview.

Before the phone questions were fully developed, I had completed a fairly detailed review of the literature to develop a theory about the leadership within and by
these watershed organizations. Through the literary research I had a better idea of what questions should be asked on the phone interviews and how the questions could be shaped to identify key leadership issues. The literature I investigated involved leadership in community organizations and grassroots organizations, leadership in social movements, citizen leadership, and servant leadership. The watershed organizations varied from a 200 member organization with a board of directors to a grassroots organization with five members and very little structure. The literary research gave me a better idea of what questions should be asked and how to distinguish between the leadership of these dissimilar organizations.

Once the phone interviews were completed, I compiled the information into a record of the interviews and a summary of the key issues within each interview. This report was provided to the Alliance, the Bay Program, and NOAA. In addition, as my senior project I performed a much more detailed analysis which incorporated leadership concepts from prior classes and the additional literature I used for the project. The final senior project included a description of tasks I completed, successes and frustrations, additional leadership insights I gained, and the application of those insights to the field of leadership studies. I also incorporated many aspects of this analysis into the reports to the Alliance and others. The ultimate goal of this project is that the report I complete for Jepson will also be used to shape the policies of the EPA Chesapeake Bay Program. In addition, the Alliance and the Bay Program will be hosting a regional watershed organization conference in late spring where the results of the survey will be presented in a brochure.

The difficulty of this type of research is that a lot of bias will exist. I was the only person interviewing so that all of the results were seen through my eyes and my biases. This problem always exists with personal interviews regardless of who performed the evaluations. I minimized the biases through structured questions that were developed carefully between the Executive Director and myself. There are other
biases which could affect my work. I am not involved in the politics of the situations of the interviewees, therefore it might not have been easy for me to understand their situations or descriptions. In addition, my perspective has been biased by my work in leadership studies and with the Alliance. I cannot ignore my perspective, but I can be aware of my biases and attempt to avoid them.

In addition to biases, there are some reliability problems with my research. First, I have constructed all of the questions for the survey and interviews. The more people that collaborate, the less biased a product is. Although I did work with others on this project, my limited perspective has certainly influenced my project. Second, the method used to select the organizations for interviewing was not a very scientific process. The organizations were selected because they appeared interesting to either myself or Flanigan and fit the geographic and size requirements. This process has allowed us the opportunity to evaluate, but does limit the applicability and generalization of the results. Third, I developed guideline topics and questions for the interviews, but there was not a standard format for the interviews and no two interviews were the same. Thus, again this limits the comparability of the results. Last, my growing familiarity and ease with the interviewing process may have shifted the results because my interviewing skills improved as the process continued. This implies that I did not use the same techniques on the beginning interviews as the end interviews. There are always some unavoidable reliability and bias problems in this type of research, but I have done my best to avoid these problems.
Leadership Roles in the Project:

Working on this project has been a learning experience about nonprofit and government organizations, personal responsibility, and of course, leadership. This project was funded by the Environmental Protection Agency for completion by the Alliance. As an intern, I was pleased that the Executive Director trusted me enough to complete such a task. The undertaking required several levels of personal responsibility as I am the only individual who could ensure the success of this assignment. The end product of this project was crucial to the Alliance and the Bay Program for the summer conference they are planning. The conference will be a regional watershed association conference that will include presentations on hot environmental and organizational issues. The organizational topics and speakers will be chosen according to the research and work I completed in the interviews.

In a subtle manner, I see myself as a leader in this project because I am incorporating my ideas about leadership into the Alliance's project. Originally no one at the Bay Program or the Alliance considered leadership an important variable. Basic organizational structure and management are important variables in this project, but leadership is a crucial and often ignored factor too. I also consider myself a leader simply because I am working on this independently and much of the conference is relying on my work. In this capacity, I am able to serve as the lead researcher on a new and important issue.

Fran Flanigan, the Executive Director of the Alliance, serves as a leader who bridges the gap between the community and the government by envisioning this type of research and the watershed association conference. The Alliance as an organization serves as a figurehead leader on much of this work, but it is truly Flanigan who initiated most of the work. Flanigan has been a transformational leader for me in many ways because she has taken me under her wing and offered me guidance, but she always expects work of the highest standard from me. Through her confidence, she
empowered me to tackle this project while at the same time continually urging me to produce higher and better quality work. Together we have both been transformed by this project. Flanigan has continually motivated me to reach for more and take on more responsibility while my knowledge of the Bay associations and leadership has grown astronomically. Meanwhile, Flanigan has allowed herself to be open to new ideas of leadership and evaluation; she, too, has learned and grown from this project.

Interestingly, as I developed the project I began to discover how many organizations look to the Alliance for guidance, support, and expert knowledge. Many of the employees of the Alliance recognize that they are leaders, but no one takes credit for this or places a large emphasis on this phenomenon. The Alliance staff will act in their usual manner when the results of this survey are completed. They will host the conference and provide the Bay Program with new and important data, but they will never take credit for their work. The organization succeeds because of its role as a servant leader. The Alliance under the guidance of Flanigan chooses to serve first and lead second.
All Phases of the Project

The project originally began last summer with the construction of the mail survey (appendix A). This was a very long and arduous process due to my unfamiliarity with the subject matter and the large numbers of individuals with whom I was collaborating. I found the project challenging and rewarding because I was able to use my critical thinking skills to develop and fine tune questions about the organizations' structure, size, mission, activities, successes, frustrations, etc. The difficulty lay primarily in the activities' section of the survey because I was unfamiliar with many of the types of restoration activities and issues of watershed associations. I was able to collaborate with Flanigan and members of EPA and NOAA to develop a fairly comprehensive list. The original survey was seven pages long, but after it was presented to the Land, Growth, and Stewardship subcommittee (who is funding the project), they advised that the survey be reduced to a "user friendly" size of four pages. This was easily accomplished with some computer formatting and restructuring. The task became more difficult when several of the NOAA employees expressed concern near the printing date and the entire survey was restructured. Most of the ideas of the original survey were preserved, but it was still dramatically altered. This experience taught me a great deal about working with individuals in different organizations with different agendas. In the end, Flanigan and I were still ultimately responsible for the final draft of the survey and had the liberty to do as we pleased, but nonetheless others' opinions were respected too.

The survey was mailed to 206 watershed associations in the Chesapeake Bay region in early September. The mailing list was developed from the Alliance's Watershed Directory and cross referencing of other watershed directories and environmental directories. A total of 63 surveys were slowly returned over the months of September and October. Through November and December the results were tallied on Microsoft Excel at the NOAA office and the Alliance finally received a copy of the
results and the original surveys at the end of January 1997. During this time, I was not involved with the project, but I became involved again with the interview process.

In the beginning of February, I finally had the original surveys in my possession and began analyzing them for common themes and potential questions. I then received the database results from NOAA, but it was formatted on the wrong computer disc so I had to wait another week to obtain the final results. Once I had the original results and surveys in hand, I began to develop a list of organizations to interview. I chose approximately seven organizations from each state (Maryland, Virginia, and Pennsylvania) which were representative of different sizes and stories. Some groups indicated problems with volunteer recruitment; others told of successful activities and lobbying; others asked for advice on funding issues; overall, Flanigan and I did our best to develop a list of organizations to contact which would be representative of the geographic location, sizes, dilemmas, and successes faced by all of the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Associations.

Once the list had been finalized (Appendix C), I had to develop a list of potential questions to ask the organizations. Since every organization is unique and has a different story to tell, I decided that I would develop a list of topics to discuss with the organizations. This list (Appendix B) had potential questions to ask the organization, but there was no specific format that the interview had to follow. As I began conducting the interviews, I found that it was easiest to have the organizations begin by enhancing the previous written description of their successes and frustrations of the organization. From here, the conversation often moved to the history of the organization, the relationship with the government, the focus and mission of the organization, the individual’s perception of leadership and other important topics.

The interview conversations have been very interesting and enlightening. Completing these interviews was initially a daunting task because I do not prefer to initiate conversations on the telephone with unfamiliar people. Yet as the semester
and conversations progressed, I became much more at ease with the process because I became more familiar with the type of people with whom I would be conversing, with the type of questions that led to useful discussions, and with the format that most interviewees preferred.

In addition to becoming more familiar with the interviewing process, I also learned how difficult it is to contact approximately 20 community leaders. In a month and a half, I managed to contact most of the organizations, but it was still a long and frustrating task. I would call several individuals in one given day and leave each a message explaining myself, my affiliation with the Alliance, and my interests. Then most often they would return my call when I was unavailable and the "phone tag" game would begin. Overall though, I benefited tremendously from discussing so much with all of these organization leaders. All had a different story to tell; some were leaders of amazing organizations and movements, others were leaders of a headache and a dying movement. Yet each individual had something valuable to add to the lessons of leadership (see Results).

Not only were the results tedious, but the actually recording of the results had the potential to be problematic. I was always concerned that the interviews would be left to my interpretation and only my interpretation, but now I do not have such a strong fear. I employed several techniques which hopefully allowed me to avoid some bias. First, when I explained to the community leaders from the beginning that I was interested in conducting a 15-20 minute interview and presenting my results to the Alliance, the Bay Program, and the University of Richmond they usually understood that I would be recording the interview and spoke slowly and clearly enough for me to write down most of their main ideas. In addition, most of these individuals were familiar with presenting their ideas and accomplishments to the public, the press, or some other interested individuals so they usually had clearly formulated ideas already. Not only did they speak clearly, but when I was unsure of their point or meaning, I
would repeat back to them what I had interpreted and ask then to validate or correct it. Usually they validated it, but there were some very important instances when interviewees corrected me and clarified their ideas.

Overall, the project went fairly well and I learned a lot about the details of interviewing as research for academic work. There were moments when I was frustrated with interviewees for not responding to me or annoyed that NOAA employees were so tedious, yet when I learned something interesting from one interviewee it often negated all of my earlier frustrations. Most importantly though, I learned a lot about community leadership and servant leadership which will be evidenced in the next two sections of me paper. Since the interviews were very long and much of the information obtained was only necessary background information, I have chosen to highlight only the "Leadership Lesson" learned from each organization in the Results section rather than the transcripts of the interviews. Then in the Leadership Implications section I will discuss the implications of all of this work.
Results Section: "The Leadership Lessons"

Lesson #1: Facilitator

Organization: Nanticoke Watershed Alliance (MD)

Contact Person: Lisa Jo Frech, Executive Director

The Nanticoke Watershed Alliance is an association with a membership of organizations who have an interest in the Nanticoke River. The Alliance has grown from five member organizations to 23 members, including many state government agencies, in the last year. These members provide a diversity of resources, technical expertise, and financial stability. The significance of Frech's work along with the Board of Directors is their ability to bring two states together to work on a common goal. Since the Nanticoke River runs through both Maryland and Delaware, the two states needed to work together but had not until the Alliance was created. Frech believes the success of her organization lies in "its proactive nature of developing coalitions to avoid no-win situations." This organization is unique because of its role as a facilitator and collaborator for discussions between different interest groups, government agencies, and businesses in both Maryland and Delaware. When asked, Frech did not view herself as a leader, but instead as a "facilitator of larger group discussions." Frech did believe that her organization served as a leader of the immediate community and as a model for other type organizations to follow.

Lesson: Many of the leaders best served the community by facilitating discussions between people of different interests and opinions.

Lesson #2: Handling Change

Organization: Weems Creek Conservancy (MD)

Contact Person: Elizabeth McWethey, President

The Weems Creek Conservancy is a small umbrella organization of several home owner associations united around protecting their local creek. The organization
has had great difficulties recently for several reasons. First, there are no new leaders stepping forward. Individuals like McWethey have been involved for over 20 years and no longer have the energy or enthusiasm they once had. Second, the problems facing the Creek are now larger and more difficult than when the organization was originally founded. McWethey and the Board have spent the last several years attempting to protect the Creek from nearby highway construction, but they have experienced extreme difficulty in attempting to obtain the support they need. Their frustrations and failures have been related to their inability to develop relationships and networks with other organizations and the government in addition to their inability to recruit and develop new leadership within the organization. McWethey believed that she was a leader because the "president of any organization is always the leader."

Lesson: Leading a watershed association through internal and external changes can be very difficult, but is nonetheless crucial to the success of the organization.

Lesson #3: Diverse Organization

Organization: Friends of Dragon Run (VA)

Contact Person: Francis B. Montague, President

The Friends of Dragon Run is an organization with a local citizen membership that originated with the purchase of a small island that was to be preserved. Since the original land purchase, the organization has purchased and conserved land around the Dragon Run while organizing conservation and education programs for the public. According to Montague, the "number one success of the organization has been its cadre of generous and well meaning people, the Board of Directors." Montague explained that the largest difficulty the organization has faced has been public perception of their work and their mission. The membership is a very diverse group consisting of "plant lovers, conservationists, rednecks, educated, uneducated, liberal, conservative, and more." Montague did view himself as a leader as much as he viewed
the Board of Directors as leaders. He did not want to claim any personal responsibility for the work of the organization, but rather believed the credit was owed to all of the Board. In his eyes, the Board, as representatives of the organization, served as leaders to the entire community by attempting to get the public to understand the importance of planning and discipline when it comes to land use.

*Lesson: An organization with a diverse membership allows for a broader range of perspectives and better planning, decision making, and understanding of community problems and issues.*

---

**Lesson #4: Overcoming the Past to Build Community**

**Organization:** Berks County Conservancy (PA)

**Contact Person:** Joseph Hoffman, Senior Staff Member

The Conservancy has a large membership and five paid staff members working on their efforts to ensure the conservation of the surrounding areas in the Berks County. Hoffman believed that the key to the organization's success is its ability to organize all of the "users" of the watershed. "It is vitally important to get all users of the watershed involved. We have organized environmental groups, outdoor groups, a water supply company, residential communities, service groups, children, and more. Then we have systematically built upon what they have done in the past to build new and more stable relationships." Not only has the Conservancy built up relationships and networks, but they have also had to overcome past financial mismanagement and negative public perception from a previous staff to reach the level of acceptance they have today. Hoffman did not think he as an individual was a leader, but he did believe that the staff as collectively served as leaders of the community for coalition building and as facilitators of larger discussions between differing parties.
Lesson: Not only is facilitating discussions critical, but successful leadership continues when those relationships between different groups are continually developed and strengthened.

**Lesson #5: Continuity in a Board**

**Organization:** FORVA (Friends of the Rivers of Virginia) (VA)

**Contact Person:** William Tanger, President

FORVA is another association whose membership consists solely of organizations. FORVA is very politically active and has been successful in lobbying for some crucial changes in Virginia through legislation. The organization's primary vehicle for involvement originates from the Board of Directors and the Steering Committee. These individuals perform most of the decision making and accomplish much of the work of the organization. Tanger viewed himself as a leader within the organization, but he described the Board as the leader of the larger community. He believed that he was crucial to the administrative functioning of the organization since there were no paid staff members, but that the Board ultimately provides the guidance and vision for the organization. Interestingly, the Board has nine members and only two have changed in the last ten years. While consistency in leadership had begun to be a problem for many organizations, it does not appear to be the case yet with FORVA.

Lesson: Continuity in a board helps ensure the stability for an organization, but this could be problematic if new ideas, perspectives, etc. are not generated.

**Lesson #6: Burnout**

**Organization:** Yellow Breeches Creek Alliance (PA)

**Contact Person:** Wenda Plowman, Designated-Executive Director
Ten years ago, the Yellow Breeches Creek Alliance was a thriving citizen group focused on issues of preservation for the Yellow Breeches Creek, but they have now dwindled to an inactive status. Plowman was asked by the Board to serve as the Executive Director several years ago, but the position would be primarily volunteer with very little financial support. Plowman did not have the time to run the organization on a volunteer basis and declined the offer; since then no one else has stepped forward to help. Plowman has since taken most of the responsibility for the organization, but not enthusiastically. The biggest problem the Alliance faces is an unmotivated membership and public. There is no apparent problem for the community to focus their interests on. In addition, Plowman believes that the volunteer pool is shrinking because there are no new individuals volunteering; it is only the same tired individuals taking responsibility for their community. Plowman believed that she was a leader, but that "there is no one in the community who wants to follow." Since the Alliance was inactive, Plowman did not believe they were a leader of the community any longer.

*Lessons: A Public cannot be motivated if the leaders do not first take responsibility and express enthusiasm. When an issue or problem is resolved and a community no longer has a common interest, perhaps disbanding the organization is the next best step.*

*Lesson #7: The Lone Leader*

**Organization:** Susquehanna River Watch, Inc. (PA)

**Contact Person:** Charles Urban, Executive Director

The ultimate goal of the Susquehanna River Watch, Inc. is to protect and restore the Susquehanna River particularly from illegal dumpings. Urban is a retired water conservation officer who was disturbed by illegal dumpings on the River and began the organization in 1982. The organization has accomplished tremendous amounts of
education through workshops, materials, videos, etc. The organization appears to be led primarily by Urban. He prefers to use a great deal of coercive power to ensure that local and state governments assist him in his efforts to protect the Susquehanna. The Board is not too active in planning and decision making, nor is the membership which is primarily volunteers.

Lesson: A successful leader should not take all of the responsibility for guiding an organization; it should be a team effort between all of those involved.

Lesson #8: Networking/Building Alliances

Organization: Piankatank River Watershed Project (VA)

Contact Person: Leslie Bowie, Executive Director

The Piankatank River Watershed Project is a new organization slowly learning to build its strength and connections. Bowie believes that the largest successes of the organization have come from networking with other groups such as Master Gardeners, conservation groups, and environmental groups. The Project has slowly begun to grow because of recent press coverage which was not solicited, but generously offered. When asked of leadership, Bowie saw herself as a "positional leader" meaning she leads because of her role as Executive Director and only staff member, but she also believed that there were other crucial leaders within the organization. All of the members of the Steering Committee and other citizen volunteers are also leaders in Bowie's eyes because of their efforts to make a change within their community and beyond their responsibility as mere residents.

Lesson: The more people a leader can get involved, interested, and surrounded around a problem, the more successful the movement becomes.

Lesson #9: Goals, Vision, Keeping Positive

Organization: Swatara Creek Watershed Association (PA)
The Swatara Creek Watershed Association (SCWA) is an organization with the preservation and restoration of the Swatara Creek and the entire Bay community as its primary goal. The SCWA hosted a watershed Expo last year that brought together different environmental groups, government agencies, businesses, and other interest groups to discuss the future of the watershed. After each organization presented its work and issues, the afternoon was spent in break-out groups which set priorities and programs for the entire region. The SCWA recognized that the smaller groups within the watershed were relatively successful, but that they needed a personal identity within the Swatara efforts. The goal of the Expo was to encourage these groups to see the bigger picture and how they fit into it.

According to Litz, the successes of the organization stem from their ability to have vision and define goals. They always have one accessible spokesperson for the organization so that mixed messages are not being received by the public. The leaders of the organization take the heat and the credit when it is due and know how to keep a positive attitude so that others can believe in their efforts and philosophies too. Litz explained that it is always important to expect the unexpected and believe in yourself. In addition, the public has a lot of enthusiasm and support for the organization.

Litz believes that primary role of any leader is to develop a vision and goals. Litz herself has developed a list of steps that any community leader should follow:

1. Your way isn't always the only way.
2. Always be courteous.
3. Don't be misleading in your discussions with others.
4. Sometimes you need to take what you can get and be satisfied with that.
5. Know your own intelligence and know what you do not know.
6. Timing is crucial; pick your battles.
7. Ask questions without being rude.
8. Always say thank you!
10. Success is measured best by doing the best you can.

Litz believed that she was a leader and the other members of her Executive Council were also leaders in their ability to set visions and goals and encourage others to work towards those goals.

*Lesson: Successful citizen leaders need to set goals, have a vision, and remain positive.*

---

**Lesson #10: Recognizing the Larger Issues**

**Organization:** Chester River Association

**Contact Person:** Marsha Fritz, President

The Chester River Association (CRA) is a citizen organization which has taken more of an "intellectual" approach to the problem solving of their community. The goal of CRA is the sustainability of the community; the focus is not just on water quality, but on improving the quality of life for the entire community especially concerning economic development and land use. Fritz and past presidents of the CRA have been successful in "bringing a lot of players together to grapple with issues and reach conclusions by looking at the larger picture." Fritz believed that she serves as a leader in her capacity as president, but she also emphasized that past presidents have also been just as successful as she in facilitating the larger community discussions about the problems at hand. In addition, the Board serves as community leaders when they develop the agenda for the organization.

*Lesson: When attempting to solve problems, it is crucial to recognize that multiple forces are impacting the environment and to lead your organization to recognize these factors and the larger issues at hand.*

---
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The Other Lessons:

The interviews with the remaining organizations were either inconclusive or replicated the lessons already mentioned. The most significant insights and information gathered was incorporated by the first ten "Leadership Lessons."

There were two critical questions I was left with upon the completion of this research. First, one of the most difficult parts of the analysis was distinguishing the leader from the organization. Clearly, these two entities are not separable, but it is important to determine whether the organization and its culture cultivated these citizen leaders or whether the citizen leaders cultivated their organizations. The second set of question were related to the situation. It is important to question whether these leaders have succeeded in another environment and if these leadership lessons can be generalized for all watershed associations.

I think that both of these questions can be addressed together. All of the organizations have similar public-interest missions, very little money, and a need to persuade others of their opinions; thus, the situations were fairly similar and the lessons learned can be applied to most watershed associations. These lessons are just as applicable as Posner and Kouzes' leadership lessons; of course there will be organizations whose situations do not fit the lessons, but overall the lessons can be generalized to other watershed associations. In addition, I think the more successful citizen leaders created their organizations. I would hypothesize that these individuals would be successful in other situations as long as it was something for which they felt some amount of passion. The grassroots citizen leaders evolve out of problems in "their own backyards." If another situation allowed for these citizens leaders to develop the same sentiments that they have in these organizations, then I would feel confident that they might again evolve as leaders of that scenario too.
The Best Practices of Leadership in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Associations:

1. Many of the leaders best served the community by facilitating discussions between people of different interests and opinions.

2. Leading a watershed association through internal and external changes can be very difficult, but is nonetheless crucial to the success of the organization.

3. An organization with a diverse membership allows for a broader range of perspectives and better planning, decision making, and understanding of community problems and issues.

4. Not only is facilitating discussions critical, but successful leadership continues when those relationships between different groups are continually developed and strengthened.

5. Continuity in a board helps ensure the stability for an organization, but this could be problematic if new ideas, perspectives, etc. are not generated.

6. A Public cannot be motivated if the leaders do not first take responsibility and express enthusiasm. When an issue or problem is resolved and a community no longer has a common interest, perhaps disbanding the organization is the next best step.

7. A successful leader should not take all of the responsibility for guiding an organization; it should be a team effort between all of those involved.

8. The more people a leader can get involved, interested, and surrounded around a problem, the more successful the movement becomes.

9. Successful citizen leaders need to set goals, have a vision, and remain positive.

10. When attempting to solve problems, it is crucial to recognize that multiple forces are impacting the environment and to lead your organization to recognize these factors and the larger issues at hand.
Leadership Implications of
Chesapeake Bay Watershed Associations

In one of the first days of class in Foundations of Leadership, students are introduced to the ideas of three circles: leader, follower, and context. The central intersection point of the three circles is leadership. For three years, this framework has been the basis for most of the theories studied and developed in our time at Jepson. This project was very interesting because it was a test of whether the theories we have gathered are actually applicable in a real life situation beyond the typical group projects we perform in so many classes. The following section highlights the results and implications for leadership.

The literature on nonprofit and community organizations was important and confirmed much of the data I collected. Woolf, Santora, and Sarros emphasized the importance of successfully handling change in nonprofit organizations. In some watershed associations like the Weems Creek Conservancy or the Yellow Breeches Creek Alliance, change was the downfall of the organization because there were no leaders who had the "vision, commitment, maturity, sensitivity, inclusiveness, and action orientation" (Woolf, 256) to lead the association through the change. Meanwhile organizations like the Chester River Association have been through several decades of change because their past presidents and boards have successfully handled these dilemmas with vision and inclusiveness. Thus, change is closely related to the concept of vision and goal setting. Those organizations, like the Swatara Creek Watershed Association, who had the ability to plan beyond just one year were able to sustain and grow, while the organizations like the Friends of Dragon Run were struggling because they had not developed the ability to think about tomorrow and past today's problem.

Several organizations exemplified Knauft, Berger, and Gray's four hallmarks of excellence: a clear mission, true leadership, an involved and committed board, and
financial and human resources (4). The Nanticoke Watershed Alliance, the Swatara Creek Watershed Association, and Chester River Association were relatively financially stable with a reliable pool of volunteers. They had individuals with an innate ability for leadership, a committed board, and a mission and vision beyond 1997. Groups like the Friends of Dragon Run, Berks County Conservancy, FORVA, Susquehanna River Watch, and Piankatank Watershed Project had some of the hallmarks, but not all of them. For example, the Piankatank Project had not fully developed its human and financial resources because it was still growing slowly. The Susquehanna River Watch, Inc. did not have a committed board nor a leader who understood that he could not do it all on his own. Finally, the Yellow Breeches Creek Alliance and Weems Creek Conservancy were struggling because they were missing almost all of the crucial elements.

The broader nonprofit management techniques described by the literature were helpful for many of the organizations, but not the detailed information. For example, all of the organizations were faced with limitations on funds. While the advice offered by the literature was important, it was not very useful for organizations with only one staff member or no staff at all. In addition, the nonprofit literature emphasized the importance of board and staff relations, but this advice has limited implications since many boards of directors for the organizations completed the tasks of an absent staff.

Beyond basic leadership tactics and techniques within nonprofit and community organizations, the concepts of servant and citizen leadership were equally important. All of the successful and unsuccessful leadership scenarios, mentioned earlier, pertained to the structure of the organization rather than the purpose and mission of these organizations. The goal of all of these organizations is the betterment of their immediate community especially the environmental quality of life. All of the individuals I spoke with were citizen leaders in some manifestation because all were
"people tak[ing] sustained action to bring about change that will permit them continued or increase well being" (Couto, 12).

Many of the people I interviewed were representative of the citizen leadership described by Couto and Jack. These individuals did "not get involved with the intention of staying," but the role quickly brought "new responsibilities, new contacts, media exposure, and other trappings of leadership" (Couto 13). Yet just because these individuals are in a role of potential leadership, it does not mean that they have handled the situation well. Jack noted that citizen leadership "involve people who already have the skills and qualities of a leader, but who do not see leadership - it seeks them" (56). Thus, many of the presidents and the executive directors, like Fritz, Litz, and Frech, had those necessary skills that distinguished them as citizen leaders.

In a later article, Jack highlighted eight aspects of successful leadership which was ironically parallel to Litz's list of steps for citizen leaders. The "arts" of citizen leadership which Jack wrote about were important skills like active listening, creative conflict resolution, and reflection which successful watershed association leaders had acquired and exemplified (113-114).

In my literature section, I noted the significance of servant leadership, but I did not observe too much of that in the organizations. The community leaders did indeed perform service for their community, but there was very little evidence that they became leaders from their desire to serve first. Citizen leadership in its nature contains a certain element of servant leadership because it is helping the greater community, but I do not believe any of these individuals were overwhelming case studies of servant leadership.

In looking to the future, Heifitz's Leadership Without Easy Answers offers some of the best advice possible for these individuals. Heifitz describes leadership as adaptive work in which "people [mobilize] to tackle tough problems" (15). Leaders are faced with three types of situations: Type I, II and III. Type I situations have a
clear definition of the problem and a clear solution and require technical work to solve Type II situations have a clear problem definition, but require learning before solutions and implemented and are a combination of technical and adaptive work. Type III problems require learning to both define the problem and then develop solutions and implement them. Type III situations require adaptive leadership.

Generally the watershed associations are faced with Type III problems. The leaders of the organization hope to improve the water quality of their immediate region, but defining that problem is very difficult and the solutions are even more complex. The organizations that appear to be stable and thriving are dealing with their communities in an adaptive manner. Fritz, Frech, and Litz have recognized that the local environmental problems stem from multiple sources not just the local polluting company or slack government regulations. The leaders also know that there is not one best solution for their community. Instead, there are multiple solutions which can be developed from the brainstorming of people with different perspectives from government agencies, businesses, homeowners, farmers and environmental groups. The watershed leaders who have "identified the adaptive challenge and focused attention on the specific issues created by confronting the issues ... kept attention focused on the relevant issues .. and finally, devised a strategy that shifted responsibility for the problem to the primary stakeholder" are the citizen leaders who have turned their work into an adapting process(99-100). The best practices of these organizations lie in their ability to be adaptive leaders in difficult situations. The organizations who have faced the most difficulty are those who have yet to recognize their work as an adaptive learning process. At the watershed organization conference this summer, I hope this type of problem solving can be evidenced to all of the organizations in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed.
Appendix A- Survey + Example Results

Watershed Organization Survey

Name of Person Preparing Form ___________________________ Date __________

* Organization Name ____________________________

* Mailing Address ________________________________

(Street Address or P.O. Box)

____________________ ________________________ ______________________
City State Zipcode

* Phone (_____) (____________) * Fax (_____) (____________)

* Electronic Mail Address ________________________________

What is the area of focus for your organization? (Answer all that apply)

* Local Stream/Creek - Name(s): __________________________

* River - Name(s):

   If river, is it the whole river system including all tributaries, just the mainstem, or something else?
   Please be specific: ______________________________________

* Watershed - Name(s):

   If watershed, is it the whole watershed (including tributaries), or something else?
   Please be specific: ______________________________________

* Briefly state your organization's mission and attach any additional materials.

Participants in Your Organization Are: (Check all that apply)

□ Business/Industry Groups □ Architects □ Rural Areas
□ Residential Associations □ Farmers □ Suburban Areas
□ Environmental Groups □ Scientists □ Urban Areas
□ Planners and other Gov’t □ Educators

Number of Members

□ N/A □ 1 - 5 □ 100 - 250 □ 250 - 500
□ 16 - 50 □ 500 - 1000 □ 50 - 100 □ > 1000

□ One activity each year □ 2 or more activities per year

How would you characterize participation by your members in projects/activities?

What year did your organization begin? ________

How often do you meet?  ○ At least monthly □ At least yearly □ As needed

How does one become a member of your organization? ○ Pay Dues ○ Sign up-no dues

Do you have a Board of Directors?  □ Yes □ No

(Provide a current list of your Board members, if available.)

Number of: Paid professional/administrative staff ________

Docents or other volunteers ________

How effective is your organization in volunteer retention?

□ Very Successful □ Successful □ Unsuccessful □ N/A

How does your organization have 501(c) nonprofit status?  □ Yes □ No
Check all that apply of the following activities or topics which characterize the level of activity, interest in information, or if the topic is an interest in your watershed.

### Activities:
- Beach and stream cleanups
- Storm drain stenciling
- Composting
- Stream bank fencing
- Beautification
- Bayscaping
- Other:

### Restoration:
- Tree planting
- Tree planting along stream (riparian restoration)
- Marsh grass/SAV planting
- Fish stocking
- Oyster replenishment
- Fish Passage maintenance or repair
- Other:

### Monitoring:
- Water
- Air
- Living things (plant or animal counts)
- Other:

### Outreach/Education:
- Publications (Newsletters, Press Releases, resource guides, etc.)
- Provide database access
- Participate in public meetings
- Public education
- Field Trips
- Convene meetings (Roundtables, Workshops)
- Network with other associations/communities
- Other:

### Political:
- Lobbying
- Legislative Tracking
- Other:
### Planning/Land Use Issues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greenways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visioning processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning ordinances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watershed planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pollution Prevention Issues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waste water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesticide management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household hazardous waste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawn care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Energy Efficiency Issues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renewable resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Economic:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban redevelopment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eco-tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### How would you characterize the accountability of government agencies and elected officials? 

#### Government Agencies:

- Local government agencies
- State government agencies
- Federal government agencies

#### Elected Officials:

- Local government
- State government
- Federal government

### Where does your organization obtain information? (check all that apply)

- State agencies
- Federal agencies
- Local government agencies
- Environmental groups
- Cooperative extension services

- Databases
- Videos
- Hotlines
- Libraries
- Internet
- Television
- Radio
- Newspaper
- Other
What are your funding sources? (check all that apply)

- Government
- Federal
- State
- Local
- Private
- Foundations
- Corporations
- Membership dues
- Events or sales

Other: ____________________________

Short Answers: (Limit answers three sentences or less.)

What is your organization’s number one accomplishment in the last five years?

What has been your organization’s biggest frustration?

Are you aware of the goals of the Chesapeake Bay Program?

- Yes ( )
- No ( )
- Interested ( )

How could the Chesapeake Bay Program help your organization in its efforts?

Do you think the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay or the Chesapeake Bay Program could assist you with developing community visioning, identifying problems, formulating potential solutions, or providing technical or financial assistance? If yes, how? If no, why not?

Would you be willing to talk in more detail with someone from the Alliance or the Chesapeake Bay Program?

- Yes ( )
- No ( )

What would be the number one issue you would like to see addressed at a regional watershed organization meeting?

Would you have an interest in attending or sending a representative to a regional meeting of watershed organizations?

- Yes ( )
- No ( )

Thank you for taking time to fill out this survey. Please return promptly to:

Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay
6600 York Road
Baltimore, MD 21212

Fax (410)377-7144

Please call us if you have any questions. (410)377-6270
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Number One Accomplishment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alliance for Aquatic Resource Monitoring (Allarm)</td>
<td>Creating baseline database on streams and rivers in PA detailing the impacts of acid deposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlands Conservancy</td>
<td>Acquisition of 4,000 acre tract (LeLoup Marshes) which preserves the source of the LeLoup River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Chestnut Land Trust</td>
<td>Purchased 400 acres in Parkers Creek, wished bringing state into contact with surrounding owners to make possible washed preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Sportfishing Association</td>
<td>Passage of Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Fisheries Act, signing Presidents Exec. Order on Rec. fishing, natural aquatic conservation plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Opequon Watershed, Inc</td>
<td>Set up stream chemical and bacteria monitoring using local university lab, work with public schools to do field trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audubon Naturalist Society</td>
<td>Help defeat Disney, established network of water quality monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore City League of Environmental Voters</td>
<td>Successful election of several strongly pro-environmental candidates to city offices and MD General Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berks County Conservancy</td>
<td>Entire village along Tulpehocken Creek acquired and protected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Area Greenbelt Association Inc</td>
<td>Stopping the sale of a piece of dedicated park land from commercial development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centennial Greenway</td>
<td>Construction of trail in Sayre, PA using ISTUA Fund, cooperation with Athens Township to develop a recreational master plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Pennsylvania Conservancy</td>
<td>Preservation of Greg's Woods in Mexico, PA; Herringbone Ridge, Seven Gables, Carlisle, PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester River Association</td>
<td>1991 Countryside Exchange, Charnel (Centerville, Chestertown)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chickahominy State Scenic River Advisory Board</td>
<td>Tree planting/restoration projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chickahominy Watershed Alliance</td>
<td>To bring open debate on possible effects of &quot;plasticulture&quot; on adjacent marine ecosystems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Conservancy, Inc</td>
<td>Active Quarterly newsletter keeping members informed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Water Action</td>
<td>Successful lobbying and electoral politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conodoguinet Creek Watershed Association</td>
<td>Annual forum on state of the creek and watershed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth River Project</td>
<td>Developed community consensus on &quot;risk ranking&quot; 18 pt. Action Plan to restore the river, partnering in securing $1mn in funding for action underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Float Fishermen of Virginia</td>
<td>General involvement in conservation/water quality/access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Mason Neck</td>
<td>Regular newsletter, programs for Mason Neck community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of the Nanticoke River</td>
<td>Developing the Nanticoke Watershed Alliance joining environmental, business and govt. interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of the North Fork Shenandoah River</td>
<td>Creating awareness of preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Dragon Run</td>
<td>Achieved sensitive access site, ed prog, gift of 200 a. swamp-bottom; gift of 1st conservation eas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of the Rappahannock</td>
<td>Scenic River Status for the Rappahannock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of The Rivers of Virginia (FORVA)</td>
<td>New minimum instream flow laws in VA, along with their regs and implementation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### WorkQuest 19 ORG Accomplishment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Number One Accomplishment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Shenandoah River</td>
<td>Development of water quality monitoring program and testing laboratory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Urbanna Creek</td>
<td>Water samples once a week at four different locations, creek clean-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting Creek Watershed Management Taskforce</td>
<td>Approaching completion of management plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izaak Walton League, York Chapter #67</td>
<td>Working on 6000 feet of stream bank stabilization and fish habitat on the East Branch Codorus Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King George Environmental Association</td>
<td>Speak out against mega landfill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lackawanna River Corridor Association</td>
<td>Completion of Greenway Recon Study with COEcreation of independent affiliate(L. Conservancy); Publication of River Guide Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Lancaster County Conservancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Clearfield Creek Watershed Association</td>
<td>Playing a role in the mining industry's increasing compliance with regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magrath River Land Trust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magrath River Watershed Association</td>
<td>Obtaining Conservation Easements on undeveloped property and public education about conservation easements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martic Hills Watershed Association</td>
<td>Establishing a successful oyster nursery at Dawns Park and oyster park on the Magrath River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maury Chapter Izaak Walton</td>
<td>Assisting an Amish dairy farmer fence portion of a scenic stream through his meadow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanticoke Watershed Alliance</td>
<td>Promoting volunteer monitoring on a statewide basis through the SOS Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanticoke Watershed Preservation Committee</td>
<td>Hunting the 1st annual Nanticoke River Shad Festival last spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Nature Conservancy Maryland/D.C. Chapter</td>
<td>Killing proposed legislation for commercial drift netting of the American Shad in the DE portion of the Nanticoke River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central PA Conservancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northampton Watershed Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Oyster Recovery Partnership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potomac Conservancy</td>
<td>Rebuilding the C&amp;O Canal after the January 1995 flood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Cabin Run Ecological Laboratory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central Pa. Conservancy</td>
<td>Baseline studies of rivers, first in the U.S. to receive study of their entire length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Anne's Conservancy Association</td>
<td>Protecting over 1400 acres of private land through use of conservation easements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savitt Creek Watershed Association</td>
<td>Establishing ourselves as bold advocacy group willing to challenge loc. govt failure to implement good land planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven River Land Trust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenandoah State Scenic River Advisory Bd.</td>
<td>Obtaining conservation easements on 98 acres of developable land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inclusion of language in comp. plan to protect riparian areas of the Shenandoah Rv. and tributaries in Clarke County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Number One Accomplishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susquehanna River Watch Inc.</td>
<td>Monitoring, education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swatara Creek Watershed Association</td>
<td>Expo was successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust for Public Land</td>
<td>Regionally has assisted communities and local, state, and federal agencies in permanently protecting 6,700 acres land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper James Scenic River Advisory Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Bass Federation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watershed Protection Coalition, Inc.</td>
<td>Preventing deforestation in the Loch Raven Reservoir; increasing awareness of public in need to protect drinking water supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Creek Conservancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin Environmental Trust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Breeches Creek Alliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Biggest Frustration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance for Aquatic Resource Monitoring (Allarm)</td>
<td>Lack of adequate funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlands Conservancy</td>
<td>Maintaining volunteer level necessary to manage ACLT's property plus state owned property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Chestnut Land Trust</td>
<td>Lack of strong conservation ethic among state and Federal elected officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Sportfishing Association</td>
<td>Getting out newsletter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Opequon Watershed, Inc</td>
<td>Limited resources, try to do too much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audubon Naturalist Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore City League of Environmental Voters</td>
<td>Need more volunteers and better funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berks County Conservancy</td>
<td>Recovering from mistakes of staff in the 1980s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Area Greenbelt Association Inc</td>
<td>Working through government bureaucracies to obtain easements and land use agreements for greenbelt route and to oppose the sale of a dedicated park land f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carantouan Greenway</td>
<td>Funding and general lack of public participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Pennsylvania Conservancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester River Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chickahominy State Scenic River Advisory Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chickahominy Watershed Alliance</td>
<td>Lack of understanding/interest in watershed restoration and planning issues on the part of the general public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens for a Better Eastern Shore</td>
<td>Getting solide science on impacts of &quot;plasticulture&quot; on resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Canoeists, Inc</td>
<td>Stepping backwards in environmental issues from prior governmental standards and interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Water Action</td>
<td>Raising money to support environmental grassroots projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conodominet Creek Watershed Association</td>
<td>Inability to make general public understand the implications of land use decisions on the creek and the quality of life in the watershed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth River Project</td>
<td>Funding resources to keep up with our growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Float Fishermen of Virginia</td>
<td>Gov't agencies foot dragging &amp; policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Mason Neck</td>
<td>Community apathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of the Nanticoke River</td>
<td>Lack of progress with loc. gov't on land use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of the North Fork Shenandoah River</td>
<td>State gov't</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Dragon Run</td>
<td>Lack support/trust by loc. Gov't, failure to be exempt for loc taxes by Middlesex Cty, inability to illegal logging (No BMPs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of the Rappahannock</td>
<td>Loss of Tier II nomination for the Rappahannock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of The Rivers of Virginia (FORVA)</td>
<td>Funding for current project with budget of $130,000, Va. state of the Rivers Report (proposed).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Shenandoah River</td>
<td>Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Urbanna Creek</td>
<td>Proposal for second regional sewage treatment plant to discharge effluent into Urbanna Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting Creek Watershed Management Taskforce</td>
<td>Encouraging participation at meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izak Walton League, York Chapter #67</td>
<td>Assistance from state and Federal agencies. outdated technology used for methods of stabilization (rip-rap)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King George Environmental Association</td>
<td>Local gov't and elected officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lackawanna River Conservancy Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Lancaster County Conservancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Clearfield Creek Watershed Association</td>
<td>Seeing state agencies continue to ignore obvious non-compliance by mining industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magothy River Land Trust</td>
<td>Difficulty in obtaining information of potential conservation easement donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Biggest Frustration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magoby River Watershed Association</td>
<td>Assist in obtaining assistance for oyster and SAV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martic Hills Watershed Association</td>
<td>Getting and keeping members and volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maury Chapter Izaak Walton</td>
<td>Virginia DEQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanticoke Watershed Alliance</td>
<td>Local planning and zoning, especially Wicomico County, MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanticoke Watershed Preservation Committee</td>
<td>County planning and zoning office (Sussex Cty, DE) They approve 98% of all proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Nature Conservancy Maryland/D.C. Chapter</td>
<td>The effort needed to accomplish goals vs. resources available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central PA Conservancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Octoraro Watershed Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Oyster Recovery Partnership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plankeath River Watershed Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potomac Conservancy</td>
<td>Dealing with the National Park Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Cabin Run Ecological Laboratory</td>
<td>Working with farming community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central Pa. Conservancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Anne's Conservancy Association</td>
<td>County gov't incompetence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawmills Creek Watershed Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severn River Land Trust</td>
<td>Getting owners of imp. property to realize benefits of donation of devel. rights could be to them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenandoah State Scenic River Advisory Bd.</td>
<td>Getting people to realize the BNR is stop gap measure, high cost for nutrient reduction. Advocates of &quot;zero dis&quot; systems in Shen valley and getting support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susquehanna River Watch Inc.</td>
<td>Loc. pol., illegal dumping; stream and river encroachment; lack of enviro. ed.; lack of media involmt. esp. newspapers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swatara Creek Watershed Association</td>
<td>Gov't red tape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust for Public Land</td>
<td>Limited local gov't funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper James Scenic River Advisory Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Bass Federation</td>
<td>Getting access to 3 gravel pits on the James River / Intro of grass carp into watershed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watershed Protection Coalition, INC.</td>
<td>Jurisdictions do not coordinate efforts and responsibilities for protect of drinking water supplies in reservoirs; gov't inpt, not responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weems Creek Conservancy</td>
<td>Rapid land use and growing resistance to addressing AACy as the state's transportation hub, consequences fast forward no conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wicomico Environmental Trust</td>
<td>Maintaining active membership and board members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Breeches Creek Alliance</td>
<td>Lack of participation and interest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Potential Watershed Association Phone Survey
Topics and Sample Questions

History:
• How and when was your organization founded?
• Who were the key players and issues surrounding its conception?
• Is your organization fairly similar to what it started as or is it amazingly different?

Coverage:
• How did you initially define your area of coverage (i.e. stream, watershed, river, etc.)
Was it because of political issues, geographic constraints, etc.?

Membership:
• Is your membership growing, stable, or declining? Why do you think this is so?
• What are some of your membership recruitment strategies? Which have failed and which have succeeded?
• How is your membership retention? Why do you think it is this way?
• If you have a Board of Directors what is their level of involvement? Are you satisfied or dissatisfied with their work? Do they provide needed direction and help or are they merely fundraisers and figureheads?
• If you do not have a Board, who is setting the agenda for your organization? Are you satisfied with this situation?
• How active is your membership? What percentage of people attend meetings? engage in conservation practices? engage in lobbying and political activities? attend other meetings, etc?
Are there a few key people in your organization or is the effort distributed over many?

Issues/Involvement
• Of the issues that are important to you and your area, why? What is the story of your region? Why are there issues that are important to your watershed which you association has not addressed?
• Why do you concentrate on one type of activity/involvement (whatever the survey indicates) more so then another type? i.e. more restoration oriented then lobbying oriented
• Are you involved with the Bay Tributary Strategies?
• Is your focus more of a local one or a Baywide focus?
Other Questions
• Why do you or why not do you collaborate with other nongovernment organizations in your area? other environmental groups?
• Why is your relationship good/poor with government agencies?
• Why do you utilize some information sources and not others?
• Are you financially stable or struggling? Why?
• What strategies such as lobbying, outreach, organization, etc. have been successful and you would offer as advice to similar organizations?
• Why do or don't you have a strategic plan for your organization? a sustainablity plan for your community?
• Elaborate on the successes and frustrations of your organization.

Leadership Oriented Questions
• Who are the players and stakeholders in your community?
• Who are the leaders of your organization?
• Why do or don't you consider yourself a leader of your organization?
• What role do you play and what are your responsibilities?
• Do you consider your organization a leader of the community? Why or why not?
Appendix C:

List of Watershed Organizations Contacted

Maryland:
1. Nanticoke Watershed Alliance
2. Magothy River Association
3. The Oyster Recovery Partnership
4. Chester River Association
5. Potomac River Greenways Coalition
6. Weems Creek Conservancy

Virginia:
1. Elizabeth River Project
2. Friends of Urbanna Creek
3. Friends of Dragon Run
4. Citizens for a Better Easter Shore
5. FORVA (Friends of the Rivers of Virginia)
6. Friends of the Rappahannok
7. Piankatank River Watershed Project

Pennsylvania:
1. Octoraro Watershed Association
2. Condoguinet Creek Watershed Association
3. Berks County Conservancy
4. Susquehanna River Watch, Inc.
5. Swatara Creek Watershed Association
6. Carantovan Greenway
7. Yellow Breeches Creek Alliance
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