Maryland at a Crossroads: Navigating the Escalation of Disaster Risk and Climate Volatility (2019-2030)

Executive Summary

Our Future Proofing Maryland report provides a comprehensive analysis of the disaster landscape for the State of Maryland, examining the historical record from 2019 to 2025 and presenting a forward-looking risk assessment for the period of 2025 to 2030. ***The central finding of our analysis is that Maryland faces a significant and widening "undeclared disaster gap," wherein the official record of federally declared disasters presents a deceptively tranquil picture that masks the true and accelerating financial and societal costs of climate-driven events***. While federal declarations have been infrequent, the underlying frequency of high-cost weather and climate events has tripled in the last five years, subjecting the State's economy, infrastructure, and communities to a persistent and growing strain.

However, the second part of our analysis details highly successful, innovative, and what we believe are scalable strategies for the Nation - the Chesapeake Bay Initiative and the Montgomery County Green Bank. Leveraging nature-based solutions with extensive technology, equipment, data integration has proven the role of restoration AND resilience are both measurable and lasting strategies for pre-disaster mitigation - both coastal and inland. The unique Public-Private-Philanthropic Partnerships ("P4s") are precisely what Future Proofing America seeks as exemplars and investible projects.

The period between 2019 and 2025 was characterized by a low number of formal Presidential Disaster Declarations. Excluding the unique circumstances of the COVID-19 pandemic, the state received only one major declaration for a weather-related event: Tropical Storm Isaias in 2020. This storm triggered a robust federal response, unlocking nearly $14 million in Public Assistance grants for infrastructure repair. However, a comparative analysis with the catastrophic May 2025 floods in Western Maryland reveals a critical vulnerability in the state's reliance on federal aid. Despite causing over $33 million in damages—far exceeding federal thresholds—the Western Maryland event was denied federal assistance, forcing the state to activate its own nascent disaster fund for the first time. This starkly illustrates that the federal declaration process is not a guaranteed backstop, exposing Maryland, particularly its smaller and rural communities, to significant uncovered financial risk.

Beneath the surface of the official declaration record, data from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) reveals a more alarming trend. The annual average number of billion-dollar weather and climate events affecting Maryland has surged from a long-term average of 1.9 to 5.6 over the last five years (2020-2024). These events, primarily driven by severe storms, hurricanes, and winter storms, have inflicted a cumulative economic cost of $10 billion to

$20 billion on the state since 1980. This high-frequency, high-cost pattern represents a "new normal" that challenges traditional risk management frameworks for the insurance industry, public finance, and private enterprise.

Looking towards 2030, this risk profile is set to intensify. Scientific consensus projects that Maryland will experience between one and 1.6 feet of sea-level rise by 2050, leading to a dramatic increase in chronic coastal flooding. Simultaneously, the frequency and intensity of extreme precipitation events are expected to rise, increasing the risk of inland flash floods. The convergence of these two hazards creates a compound flood risk that threatens to overwhelm existing infrastructure, particularly in the populous Chesapeake Bay region.

This escalating climate threat poses a direct challenge to the viability of Maryland's critical economic assets and long-term strategic investments. The Port of Baltimore, a vital economic engine recently enhanced by the $466 million Howard Street Tunnel expansion, is situated in a low-lying area highly vulnerable to sea-level rise and storm surge. Similarly, the State's ambitions in the multi-billion-dollar offshore wind sector face not only regulatory hurdles but also a substantial physical risk from major hurricanes, which have the potential to cause catastrophic damage to turbine farms. This indicates a potential strategic misalignment between the State's economic development goals and its climate adaptation planning, creating the risk of stranded assets and significant future economic losses.

To navigate this challenging future, our report puts forth a series of strategic recommendations, while also raising up the successful work for which Maryland has implemented - and therefore must consider "doubling down" to continue the higher value of resilience. Future Proofing Maryland as a strategy must move decisively to enhance financial resilience by aggressively capitalizing the State Disaster Recovery Fund. It is imperative to integrate forward-looking climate projections into all major infrastructure and capital planning processes. Land-use policies and building codes must be modernized to reflect future compound flood risks.

Finally, the Maryland must pursue proactive strategies with the insurance market and prioritize investments in nature-based solutions to build a more resilient and sustainable foundation for its economy and communities in the coming decade. The 2025-2030 period represents a critical window for action; delaying these measures will significantly increase the cost and complexity of adaptation in the future.

This report has not been prepared using our "Risk and Resilience Assessment" of the Resilience Data Xchange's robust 100+ billion data points at the county, zip code, census tract, nor parcel level. Such a forecasted, predictive analyses may be valuable to convene all "enlightened self-interested" stakeholders, especially the private and philanthropic sectors, to a new framework.

Maryland's Evolving Disaster Landscape: 2019-2025

An analysis of Maryland's official disaster history from 2019 to 2025, based on federal declarations, suggests a state with minimal exposure to catastrophic events. However, this official record belies a more complex reality of increasing preparedness activities at the state level, revealing a growing gap between the frequency of hazardous events and the threshold for federal intervention. This section details the formal disaster record, explains the mechanisms of the declaration process, and examines the state's emergency management architecture to contextualize this emerging challenge.

Official Federal Declaration Record (2019-2025)

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) maintains a record of all Presidential declarations, which are the primary mechanism for unlocking significant federal aid. For the State of Maryland, the period from January 1, 2019, through September 2025 has been notably quiet in terms of weather-related federal interventions. During the five full years from 2020 to 2024, Maryland averaged just 0.6 disaster declarations per year, with no declarations issued in 2024 and none as of the end of the third quarter of 2025.[1]

The three federal declarations issued for Maryland during this period were dominated by the response to the COVID-19 pandemic, a biological event rather than a traditional weather or climate disaster.

Declaration Number	Date Declared	Incident Type	Designated for Assistance
EM-3430-MD	March 13, 2020	Emergency (COVID-19)	Statewide
DR-4491-MD	March 26, 2020	Major Disaster (COVID-19 Pandemic)	Statewide
DR-4583-MD	February 4, 2021	Major Disaster (Tropical Storm Isaias)	Calvert, Dorchester, St. Mary's Counties

Source: Federal Emergency Management Agency [1]

The two declarations for COVID-19 provided federal assistance under Public Assistance Category B, which covers emergency protective measures taken to respond to public health crises.[3] The only weather-related event to trigger a federal response was Tropical Storm Isaias, which occurred in

August 2020 but was not formally declared a Major Disaster until February 2021.[1] This low frequency of official declarations creates a public and policy perception of minimal disaster risk, a perception that is increasingly at odds with the state's own internal preparedness posture.

The Declaration Process and Its Nuances

A federal disaster declaration is not an automatic or objective measure of an event's severity. It is the culmination of a formal administrative process governed by the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act.[4] The process begins when a governor determines that an event has overwhelmed the response and recovery capabilities of state, local, and tribal governments.[1] The governor then submits a formal request to the President, detailing the extent of the damage and the types of federal assistance needed.[4]

FEMA regional offices work with state officials to conduct a Preliminary Damage Assessment (PDA) to validate the reported damages and determine if they meet certain financial thresholds.[4] However, meeting these thresholds is a necessary but not sufficient condition for approval. The President retains the final authority to approve or deny the request based on a variety of factors, including the severity and magnitude of the event and FEMA's recommendation.[1] This introduces a layer of subjectivity and, as alleged by state officials in recent events, potential political considerations that can influence the outcome.[7] The process can be lengthy and uncertain, as demonstrated by the six-month gap between Tropical Storm Isaias and its eventual declaration.

Maryland's Emergency Management Architecture

The Maryland Department of Emergency Management (MDEM) is the state's lead agency for coordinating a comprehensive, all-hazards approach to emergency management, encompassing preparedness, response, mitigation, and recovery.[8] The agency's history reflects a significant evolution from its origins as a Civil Defense agency focused on nuclear attack preparedness during the Cold War to a modern entity addressing a wide range of natural, technological, and terrorist threats.[8] MDEM works in partnership with local jurisdictions, state agencies, and federal partners like FEMA to manage the consequences of disasters that exceed local capabilities.[9]

A review of MDEM's operational tempo indicates a significant increase in preparedness activities, which contrasts sharply with the low number of federal declarations. The number of large-scale training exercises coordinated by or involving MDEM has shown a dramatic upward trend, increasing from 11 in both 2020 and 2021 to a projected 45 in 2024.[11] This fourfold increase in high-level exercises suggests that state emergency managers perceive a heightened risk environment that requires a more robust and practiced response capability. If the risk landscape were as placid as the federal declaration record implies, such a significant and costly ramp-up in preparedness would be difficult to justify. This discrepancy points to a crucial reality: Maryland is experiencing and preparing for a growing number of disruptive events that require a coordinated response but ultimately fall below the stringent, and sometimes unpredictable, criteria for a Presidential Disaster Declaration.

State-Level Preparedness Actions

In the absence of federal declarations, the Governor of Maryland retains the authority to issue state-level emergency declarations. These declarations serve to enhance coordination among state agencies, activate emergency plans, and facilitate the deployment of state resources. A recent example is the "State of Preparedness" declaration issued by Governor Wes Moore in June 2025 ahead of a potentially hazardous heat wave.[12] While these state-level actions are vital for managing immediate threats and ensuring public safety, they do not unlock the substantial financial resources available through FEMA's Public Assistance and Hazard Mitigation Grant Programs. This creates the "undeclared disaster gap," where the state and its local governments are left to bear the full financial burden of recovery from events that are damaging but do not trigger federal aid. The cumulative effect of these smaller, unfunded events represents a significant and growing financial strain on public resources.

Case Study Analysis: A Tale of Two Disasters

The critical importance of a Presidential Disaster Declaration—and the profound consequences of its denial—are best understood through a direct comparison of two significant weather events in Maryland: Tropical Storm Isaias in 2020 and the Western Maryland floods of 2025. These two disasters, one receiving federal aid and the other being denied, provide a stark illustration of the financial and operational fault lines in the nation's disaster response framework and highlight Maryland's vulnerability to unpredictable outcomes in the declaration process.

Tropical Storm Isaias (2020): The Federal System Activated

On August 3-4, 2020, Tropical Storm Isaias moved rapidly up the East Coast, bringing a combination of heavy rain, strong winds, and tornadic activity to Maryland.[13] While not a major hurricane at the time of its passage through the state, the storm's impacts were significant, particularly in southern Maryland and along the Chesapeake Bay. The National Weather Service confirmed three tornadoes in Calvert and St. Mary's counties, with ratings of EF-0 and EF-1, which caused considerable tree damage, downed power lines, and damaged homes and other structures.[14] Widespread flash flooding was also reported in several counties, including St. Mary's, Calvert, Charles, Baltimore, and Harford.[13]

The economic and infrastructure impacts were substantial enough to warrant a coordinated response. The Maryland Emergency Management Agency (MDEM) reported statewide damage estimates of just over $22 million.[13] A critical economic impact was the disruption to the Port of Baltimore. In anticipation of the storm's arrival, the U.S. Coast Guard declared "Port Condition

Zulu," a measure that prohibits all vessel traffic, effectively closing the port to commercial shipping.[16] This temporary shutdown, though brief, underscored the vulnerability of one of the state's most vital economic engines to acute weather events.

Following a damage assessment process, Governor Larry Hogan requested federal assistance. On February 4, 2021, six months after the storm, President Joseph R. Biden issued Major Disaster Declaration DR-4583-MD.[17] This declaration was a critical financial turning point for the affected communities. It made federal funding available through FEMA's Public Assistance (PA) program to Calvert, Dorchester, and St. Mary's counties, covering 75% of the eligible costs for emergency work and the repair or replacement of disaster-damaged public facilities.[17]

The flow of federal aid was substantial. As of March 2025, FEMA had obligated a total of **$13,988,797.94** in Public Assistance grants for DR-4583. This included $1,157,604.68 for emergency work (Categories A-B) and $11,696,876.33 for permanent work (Categories C-G) to repair infrastructure such as roads, bridges, and public utilities.[19] Furthermore, the declaration unlocked an additional **$1,703,690.13** through the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP), making funds available statewide for projects designed to reduce the risk of future disaster damages.[19] This infusion of nearly $16 million in federal funds was instrumental in the recovery of the affected counties.

Western Maryland Floods (2025): The Federal System Denied

In stark contrast to the outcome of Tropical Storm Isaias, the catastrophic flooding in Western Maryland in May 2025 serves as a cautionary tale. On May 13, 2025, a series of intense thunderstorms stalled over Allegany and Garrett counties, unleashing more than five inches of rain in a short period.[5] The resulting flash floods were historic. Georges Creek rose over six feet, while the North Branch of the Potomac River swelled by nearly 15 feet, inundating the communities of Midland, Lonaconing, Barton, and Westernport.[5] The situation became so dire that emergency services had to conduct water rescues for approximately 150 students and 50 faculty members from the flooded Westernport Elementary School.[7] The damage to roads, water and sewer infrastructure, utilities, and property was extensive.[5]

Governor Wes Moore promptly declared a state of emergency and, on June 13, 2025, formally requested a Presidential Major Disaster Declaration from the White House.[12] The request was supported by a joint Preliminary Damage Assessment conducted by state, local, and FEMA officials. This assessment validated that the damages far exceeded the established federal aid thresholds. Allegany County's individual threshold is $321,460, while Maryland's statewide threshold is $11,674,953.[6] The initial damage estimate was $15.8 million, which was already above the state threshold. A subsequent reassessment validated by FEMA raised the total estimated damages to **$33.7 million**—nearly three times the state's required threshold.[6]

Despite the clear and validated evidence of overwhelming damage, FEMA denied Maryland's request on July 22, 2025, in a letter stating that supplemental federal assistance was "not warranted".[7] Governor Moore condemned the decision, suggesting it was "petty" and "partisan," and formally appealed on August 19.[6] On October 23, 2025, FEMA officially denied the appeal, permanently closing the door on federal assistance for the disaster.[22]

The financial fallout from this denial was immediate and severe. Allegany and Garrett counties, rural areas with limited tax bases, were left to face a $33.7 million recovery bill on their own.[6] The denial forced the state to take unprecedented action. For the first time since the program's creation, Governor Moore authorized the use of the **Maryland State Disaster Recovery Fund**, allocating an initial $459,375 to provide essential help to impacted households.[12] This was later supplemented by an additional $1 million in Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) funds.[6] While crucial, this state-level aid represented less than 5% of the total validated damages, leaving a massive financial gap.

Metric	Tropical Storm Isaias (2020)	Western Maryland Floods (2025)
Event Type	Tropical Storm, Tornadoes, Flooding	Severe Storm, Flash Flooding
Estimated Economic Damage	~$22 Million	$33.7 Million
State Aid Threshold Exceeded?	Yes	Yes (by nearly 300%)
Presidential Declaration Status	**Approved** (DR-4583-MD)	**Denied** (Initial Request & Appeal)
Federal PA/HMGP Funding	**~$15.7 Million**	**$0**
State Disaster Fund Activated	No	**Yes** (~$1.5 Million)

Source: FEMA, MDEM, Governor's Office Press Releases [19]

The divergent outcomes of these two events reveal a critical flaw in relying solely on federal disaster aid. The declaration process is not a simple, formulaic calculation based on damage totals. The Western Maryland floods were more costly and arguably more concentrated in their devastation than Tropical Storm Isaias, yet they failed to secure federal support. This suggests that other, less transparent factors—such as the geographic location, the type of hazard, or the political landscape—can play a decisive role. This uncertainty creates a dangerous precedent, particularly for smaller, rural communities that are most vulnerable and least able to absorb the financial shock of an undeclared disaster. The experience has forced Maryland to recognize the necessity of building a more robust and self-sufficient financial capacity to manage disaster recovery, as the federal backstop can no longer be considered a guarantee.

The Hidden Toll: Quantifying Maryland's Billion-Dollar Climate Events

The official federal disaster declaration record for Maryland, with its low frequency of events, creates a significant blind spot in assessing the state's true risk exposure. A more accurate and alarming picture emerges from the economic data compiled by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), which tracks weather and climate events with losses exceeding $1 billion. This dataset reveals that Maryland is being affected by high-cost disasters with a frequency that is not only dramatically higher than the declaration record suggests but is also accelerating at a concerning rate.

The Accelerating Frequency of High-Cost Events

Between 1980 and 2024, Maryland was impacted by 85 distinct weather and climate disasters that each caused at least $1 billion in damages (adjusted for inflation).[24] This equates to a long-term historical average of 1.9 such events per year. While this figure itself is significant, it masks a dramatic escalation in recent years.

An analysis of this trend by decade shows a clear and sustained increase in event frequency. However, the most striking acceleration has occurred in the most recent five-year period.

Time Period	Total Events Affecting Maryland	Average Events Per Year
1980-2024 (45-Year Average)	85	1.9
2010-2019 (10-Year Period)	27	2.7
2020-2024 (Last 5 Years)	28	**5.6**

Source: NOAA National Centers for Environmental Information (NCEI) [24]

The data shows that the annual frequency of billion-dollar events affecting Maryland in the last five years (5.6 events/year) has nearly tripled compared to the long-term historical average. This shift from infrequent, major shocks to a near-constant series of costly disruptions represents a fundamental change in the state's risk profile. It is this high-frequency pattern, rather than the occasional federally declared disaster, that constitutes the "new normal" for Maryland's economy and public finances.

Total Economic Impact

The cumulative economic toll of these 85 events on the State of Maryland is substantial, with NOAA estimating the total cost to be between $10 billion and $20 billion.[24] This figure primarily accounts for direct costs, such as damage to residential and commercial property, public infrastructure, and agricultural losses. It is important to note that these are conservative estimates. The methodology does not capture a wide range of indirect and secondary costs, such as business interruption, supply chain disruptions, environmental degradation, or long-term public health impacts, meaning the true economic toll is likely even higher.[25]

Primary Hazard Drivers

An analysis of the types of disasters causing these billion-dollar losses reveals the primary threats to Maryland's economy. While the state is exposed to a variety of hazards, three categories account for the vast majority of both the frequency and the cost of these major events.

According to NOAA's data for the 1980-2024 period, the breakdown of the 85 billion-dollar events affecting Maryland is as follows [24]:

- **Severe Storms:** This is the most frequent category, comprising 38 separate events (44.7% of the total). These events, which include thunderstorms with high winds, hail, and tornadoes, have caused an estimated $2.0 billion to $5.0 billion in damages.
- **Hurricanes:** While less frequent than severe storms, with 15 events (17.6%), tropical cyclones (hurricanes and tropical storms) are by far the costliest. They are responsible for an estimated **$5.0 billion to $10.0 billion** in damages, accounting for nearly 40% of the state's total losses from billion-dollar events. This highlights that the "tail risk" from a single major hurricane remains the largest single financial threat to the state.
- **Winter Storms:** Maryland has been affected by 16 major winter storm events (18.8%), including blizzards and ice storms, which have caused an estimated $2.0 billion to $5.0 billion in damages.
- **Drought:** The state has also been impacted by 10 significant drought and heat wave events (11.8%), with associated costs also in the range of $2.0 billion to $5.0 billion.[24]

This risk profile indicates a dual threat: a new baseline of frequent, costly disruptions from severe storms and winter storms, punctuated by the persistent and financially dominant threat of a high-impact tropical cyclone. This pattern challenges traditional risk management models that may focus on rare, catastrophic events. For the insurance industry, it necessitates a shift toward pricing for a continuous stream of significant losses, which can lead to rising premiums and reduced coverage availability.[25] For state and local governments, it means budgets will be persistently stressed by recovery and repair costs from these "undeclared" but economically damaging events. For businesses, it demands a greater focus on building operational resilience and robust business continuity plans, as disruptions become a regular feature of the economic landscape.

Forecast Horizon (2025-2030): Projecting Maryland's Climate Future

The historical acceleration of costly weather events provides a clear warning for the future. To effectively prepare for the coming decade, it is essential to move beyond historical analysis and incorporate forward-looking scientific projections. Authoritative climate models provide a consensus view that Maryland will face an intensification of key climate hazards, particularly sea-level rise and extreme precipitation. The convergence of these threats will create compound risks that will further stress the state's infrastructure, environment, and economy.

The Inexorable Threat of Sea-Level Rise (SLR)

Maryland's extensive 3,190-mile shoreline makes it one of the most vulnerable states in the nation to the impacts of sea-level rise.[27] This vulnerability is compounded by the fact that the land in the Chesapeake Bay region is naturally subsiding, causing the relative rate of sea-level rise to be higher than the global average.[28]

A 2023 expert report led by the University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science (UMCES), which is required by state law to be updated every five years, provides the most relevant projections for planning purposes. The report finds that the sea-level rise Maryland will experience in the first half of the 21st century will equal or exceed the total rise observed during the entire 20th century.[27]

Climate Hazard	Projected Change by 2050 (from 2000-2005 baseline)	Source
Relative Sea-Level Rise	Likely between 0.3 m (1.0 ft) and 0.5 m (1.6 ft)	UMCES 2023 [27]
High-Tide Flooding Days (Baltimore)	Between 50 and 155 days per year (up from 11 in 2019)	UMD Coastal Climate Program [25]

These projections have profound implications. The rise in baseline sea level will lead to a dramatic increase in the frequency of "nuisance" or high-tide flooding, which occurs even in the absence of a storm. The projection that a major city like Baltimore could experience tidal flooding on anywhere from 50 to 155 days per year by 2050 signals a shift from occasional inconvenience to chronic disruption of daily life and commerce.[25] Beyond nuisance flooding, this inexorable rise in sea level will permanently inundate low-lying lands, accelerate shoreline erosion, destroy critical coastal wetlands that provide natural flood protection, and drive saltwater intrusion into coastal aquifers and agricultural lands, threatening both drinking water supplies and farming.[27]

The Intensification of Extreme Precipitation

Concurrent with rising seas, Maryland's climate is projected to become wetter, with a notable increase in the intensity of rainfall events. Climate models consistently project an increase in average annual precipitation, particularly during the winter and spring seasons.[30] More critically for flood risk, the character of this precipitation is changing. The frequency and intensity of heavy downpours are expected to increase significantly.[28]

This trend means that storms will be capable of delivering more rain in shorter periods, overwhelming existing stormwater management systems and increasing the risk of dangerous flash floods, similar to the event that devastated Western Maryland in 2025. Projections indicate that what is currently considered a 100-year storm event (a storm with a 1% chance of occurring in any given year) could happen far more frequently, potentially as often as every 20 to 50 years by the end of the century.[31] Research focused on the broader Northeast region projects a 52% increase in extreme precipitation by 2099, driven primarily by a greater number of heavy rainfall days.[32] This shift will require a fundamental rethinking of infrastructure design standards and will expand the geographic areas considered to be at high risk of flooding.[31]

The convergence of these two primary threats—sea-level rise and extreme precipitation—creates a compound flood risk that is particularly acute for Maryland. The state's most populous and economically vital regions are situated along the Chesapeake Bay and its many tidal tributaries. As sea levels rise, the baseline water level in these estuaries is higher, which reduces their capacity to absorb and drain freshwater runoff from the land. When a heavy precipitation event occurs, the increased river discharge flows downstream into a bay that is already elevated. If this coincides with a high tide or a coastal storm surge, the freshwater runoff is effectively blocked from draining, causing water to pile up from both directions. This compound flooding can lead to more severe, widespread, and prolonged inundation than would be caused by either coastal flooding or riverine flooding alone. Current flood maps and infrastructure design standards, which often model these hazards separately, may therefore severely underestimate the true future flood risk in these critical areas, creating a significant hidden liability for planners and property owners.

Critical Infrastructure and Economic Sector Vulnerability Assessment

The projected changes in Maryland's climate present direct and material threats to the state's key economic sectors and critical infrastructure. The increasing frequency of high-cost weather events, combined with the long-term stressors of sea-level rise and extreme precipitation, will challenge the resilience of the insurance market, the viability of vital transportation hubs like the Port of Baltimore, and the feasibility of emerging industries such as offshore wind. This section assesses these specific vulnerabilities, revealing a potential disconnect between the state's economic development ambitions and its climate adaptation strategies.

Insurance, Real Estate, and Financial Stability

The escalating frequency of billion-dollar disasters is placing immense pressure on the global and national insurance industries. The first half of 2025 alone saw $84 billion in global insured losses from natural catastrophes, a figure 55% higher than the 10-year average, with the United States accounting for a disproportionate 92% of weather-related insured losses.[33] This trend of rising claims and greater exposure to catastrophic losses is not sustainable without significant market adjustments.[26]

For Maryland, this national trend will translate into direct local impacts. Insurers will be forced to re-price risk, leading to higher premiums for homeowners and businesses, particularly in vulnerable coastal areas.[25] In the highest-risk zones, insurers may reduce their exposure by not renewing policies or ceasing to write new ones altogether. This can trigger a cascade of negative economic consequences: a "protection gap" widens as property becomes underinsured or uninsured, shifting the financial burden of recovery onto individuals and government; the lack of available insurance can become a barrier to new development and real estate transactions; and homeowners may face mortgage defaults if they cannot maintain required insurance coverage.[25] This dynamic threatens not only individual financial security but also the stability of the broader real estate market and the tax base of coastal communities.

The Port of Baltimore: Resilience of a Vital Economic Engine

The Helen Delich Bentley Port of Baltimore is a cornerstone of Maryland's economy, and significant recent investments have been made to secure its future competitiveness. The centerpiece of this effort is the recently completed **$466 million Howard Street Tunnel expansion project**.[34] This complex engineering feat, funded through a partnership of federal, state, and private (CSX) capital, involved lowering the tunnel floor to accommodate double-stacked intermodal freight trains.[34] Completed ahead of schedule in late 2025, this project removes a long-standing bottleneck on the I-95 rail corridor, enhancing efficiency and increasing the port's capacity to move cargo to and from the Midwest and Northeast.[35]

Despite the project's economic importance, its long-term resilience to projected climate change is a critical concern. The Port of Baltimore and its supporting rail infrastructure, including the entrances to the 130-year-old Howard Street Tunnel, are located in low-lying coastal areas of Baltimore City that are directly exposed to the threats of sea-level rise and increased storm surge. While the project's Environmental Assessment received a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI), and the construction involved extensive dewatering systems to manage current groundwater levels, public documentation does not detail specific design accommodations for the 1 to 1.6 feet of sea-level rise projected by 2050.[35]

The temporary but complete shutdown of the Port during Tropical Storm Isaias in 2020 serves as a stark reminder that its operations are vulnerable to disruption from even moderate coastal storms.[16] As sea levels rise, the frequency and severity of such disruptions are set to increase, posing a long-term risk to the return on this massive public and private investment.

Emerging Energy Sector: Hurricane Risk to Offshore Wind Development

As part of its strategy to transition to a clean energy economy, Maryland is actively promoting the development of major offshore wind projects off its Atlantic coast. These multi-billion-dollar infrastructure projects promise to generate significant clean energy and create new jobs. However, the industry faces considerable non-financial risks, including political and regulatory uncertainty, as evidenced by recent legal challenges and shifting federal positions on project approvals.[38]

Beyond these challenges, the physical vulnerability of this nascent industry to hurricanes represents a substantial, concentrated financial risk. Scientific analysis of wind turbine structural integrity indicates that while turbines are designed to withstand significant wind speeds (typically a 50-year return period event, or approximately 97-knot winds), they are vulnerable to catastrophic failure in more intense storms.[40] Research published in the *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* estimates that a Category 3 hurricane (with sustained winds of 96-112 knots) has the potential to cause tower buckling in up to 46% of the turbines in a given wind farm.[40] Given that the Atlantic coast of the United States is regularly threatened by major hurricanes, this represents a severe risk to the financial viability of these projects. A single major storm could wipe out billions of dollars in assets, with profound consequences for developers, investors, and the insurance companies that underwrite them.

The state's concurrent pursuit of massive, long-term capital investments in coastal assets—both in upgrading existing infrastructure like the Port and fostering new industries like offshore wind—reveals a potential strategic misalignment. The economic success of these ventures is fundamentally dependent on their ability to operate reliably for decades in a rapidly deteriorating climate. A failure to fully integrate robust, forward-looking climate resilience into the design, siting, and financing of these projects today risks creating stranded assets and imposing massive unfunded liabilities on the state and its private partners in the future.

Federal Facilities and Operations

Maryland hosts a concentration of federal assets that are operationally indispensable to U.S. national and economic security, centered on its role as the nation's hub for intelligence, cyber operations, and advanced military research. This strategic footprint, however, faces significant and escalating risk exposure from natural disasters, particularly flooding. The primary vulnerabilities are not just physical but operational, threatening mission continuity for critical defense agencies.

The state's two most significant assets, **Fort Meade** and **Aberdeen Proving Ground (APG)**, anchor this federal presence. Fort Meade, the nation's "center for information, intelligence, and cyber operations," hosts the **National Security Agency (NSA)**, **U.S. Cyber Command (USCYBERCOM)**, and the **Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA)**. APG, a 72,000-acre "megabase," is the Army's primary center for **Research, Development, Testing, and Evaluation (RDT&E)**, including the **C4ISR Center of Excellence**. These facilities are supported by a regional ecosystem of critical infrastructure, including the power grid and transportation networks, upon which their missions depend.

These assets face distinct, quantifiable physical risks:

- **Aberdeen Proving Ground (Coastal Vulnerability):** Due to its extensive shoreline on the Chesapeake Bay, APG is exceptionally vulnerable to sea-level rise and storm surge. A 2019 resiliency study projected that a mid-range sea-level rise scenario combined with a major flood event (MFS) in **2050 would inundate 31% of APG's total area**, impacting over 100 infrastructure structures. This risk profile directly threatens advanced laboratories and testing facilities essential for C4ISR and Army modernization.
- **Fort Meade (Riverine Flood Vulnerability):** While more inland, Fort Meade is highly susceptible to riverine flooding from the adjacent Little Patuxent River. NOAA gauge data shows that "Moderate" flooding—a stage reached multiple times since 2019—is sufficient to **inundate Maryland Route 198, a primary access road to the installation**, and

encroach on Tipton Airport, which is part of Fort Meade. This recurring threat of access denial and on-post flooding, which damaged 15% of the NSA's vehicle fleet in a 2014 event, creates a high-frequency operational risk.

From a national security perspective, the physical risk translates directly into mission risk. A "Delayed Opening" or "Reduced Operation" at these facilities is not a simple administrative matter. For **USCYBERCOM** and the **NSA**, a disruption caused by flooding, or more critically, a widespread power outage from a severe storm, risks "corruption of data," "damage to high value equipment," and "delays in... high priority intelligence requirements." The Department of Defense identifies the disruption of its power-projection and cyber-response capabilities as a primary goal of U.S. adversaries. Similarly, the flooding of irreplaceable R&D facilities at **APG** would create catastrophic setbacks in weapons development and technology timelines. The risk is significant enough that the DoD is actively funding the **Resilient Maryland Defense Communities Project** to align state, county, and military resilience planning to mitigate these precise threats.

Strategic Recommendations and Outlook to 2030

The analysis presented in this Future Proofing Maryland report indicates that the State stands at a critical juncture. The historical record and forward-looking climate projections paint a clear picture of escalating risk that demands a fundamental shift in it's approach to disaster management, infrastructure planning, and economic development. The period between 2025 and 2030 is a crucial window for continuing to implement and to increase investment in proactive strategies to build resilience and mitigate the most severe impacts of the coming changes. The following recommendations are designed to provide a strategic roadmap for state policymakers, infrastructure planners, private sector leaders. We offer our "Resilience Capital Investment Stack" working group solutions - Community Mutual Risk Pools, Resilience Utility Districts, Resilience Community Trusts, and similar investible platforms on which to attract non-state resources as partners in a higher level of resilience. Our goal is to achieve a 1:11 cost-benefit from pre-disaster risk exposure preparedness and mitigation. .

Enhance State-Level Financial Resilience

The denial of federal aid for the 2025 Western Maryland floods was a watershed moment, exposing the dangerous unreliability of the federal disaster declaration process as a financial backstop. Maryland must transition from a posture of federal reliance to one of greater self-sufficiency.

- **Recommendation:** Aggressively capitalize the State Disaster Recovery Fund with a dedicated, recurring revenue source. The fund's first-ever use in 2025 was a successful proof of concept, but its scale is wholly inadequate to cover the costs of a major undeclared disaster.[22] Lawmakers should explore options such as dedicated fees on insurance premiums or real estate transactions to create a robust fund capable of deploying tens of millions of dollars in the aftermath of an event that fails to secure a Presidential declaration.

Integrate Climate Projections into All Capital Planning

The state is making multi-generational investments in critical infrastructure that will be directly exposed to a more volatile climate. It is imperative that these investments are designed for the conditions of the future, not the past.

- **Recommendation:** Mandate that all state-funded or state-approved major infrastructure projects undergo a rigorous Climate Vulnerability Assessment. This assessment must utilize the latest scientific projections for sea-level rise, extreme precipitation, and other relevant hazards from authoritative sources like the University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science.[27] The findings must be used to inform project siting, engineering design standards, and long-term financial and operational modeling to avoid the creation of stranded assets.

Modernize Land-Use and Building Codes

The increasing threat of compound flooding requires a modernization of the regulatory frameworks that govern where and how communities are built.

- **Recommendation:** The state should lead an effort to update statewide building codes and guide local zoning ordinances to reflect forward-looking flood risk, incorporating the combined effects of sea-level rise and extreme precipitation. This should include restricting new critical infrastructure development in the most vulnerable areas, requiring higher freeboard standards for new construction, and incentivizing the use of flood-resilient construction techniques and materials.

Develop a Proactive Insurance Market Strategy

A stable and affordable insurance market is critical for economic security. As climate risk increases, the state must work proactively with the industry to prevent market failures.

- **Recommendation:** The Maryland Insurance Administration should convene a task force with insurers, reinsurers, and consumer advocates to develop innovative risk-transfer mechanisms and resilience incentive programs. This could include exploring state support for catastrophe bonds, developing parametric insurance products for local governments, and creating programs that offer significant premium discounts for homeowners and businesses that invest in certified flood and wind mitigation measures.

Continued, Expand Investing in Nature-Based Solutions

Engineered solutions like seawalls have a role to play, but they are expensive and can have negative ecological consequences. Investing in natural systems can provide effective and cost-efficient protection.

- **Recommendation:** Maryland should create dedicated funding streams to accelerate the restoration and protection of its coastal wetlands, marshes, and forests. These ecosystems serve as a critical natural buffer against storm surge and erosion—a service that becomes exponentially more valuable as sea levels rise.[28] Such investments provide a dual benefit of enhancing community resilience while also improving water quality and habitat in the Chesapeake Bay.

Why Future Proofing America?

Current and forecasted disaster-related losses—including life, property, assets, and community—necessitate a multidisciplinary approach to integrating knowledge and resources. The Future Proofing America Collaborative (FPA), a 501(c)(3) nonprofit, aims to harmonize over 2,600 standards and codes for use on real estate new build and retrofit developments that enable the broad range of contributing stakeholders common resilience standards and performance benchmarks. In this way pre-disaster risk mitigation can exceed a 1:6 or better cost-benefit/return on investment by our aligning all aspects of a project including design, engineering, technology, investment capital.

The FPA Research and Design Phase develops alternative capital and investment instruments based on the FPA Standard to enhance risk mitigation across residential, commercial, industrial, and public-sector assets. The FPA Resilience Data Xchange, a database with over 40 billion data points at county, census tract, and neighborhood levels, guides decision-makers in resource allocation, investments, and asset management.

Our goal is to shift the Nation's recovery-rebuild cycle towards preparedness, risk mitigation, and community strengthening – especially as the roles, responsibilities, and resources of the federal government shift to states and municipalities. The FPA Collaborative is not a report-producing entity but rather an actionable road map!

Why ROAR Partners?

ROAR Partners, a for-profit enterprise, commercializes and generates ROI from the Future Proofing America Collaborative's work by scaling pilot projects into repeatable real estate developments through four stages:

- Risk and Resilience Assessment: Conducting analyses and feasibility studies based on the FPA Standard to generate findings and recommendations.
- Project Implementation: Engaging ROAR Partners and strategic FPA members to advise and collaborate with developers, asset owners, managers, and officials.
- Investment Advisory: Leveraging resources such as the Resilience Community Trust, Resilience Utility, Smart Watershed Districts, and the Endeavor Fund to initiate FPA-branded projects.
- Monitoring and Performance Benchmarks: Coordinating compliance and financial reviews to ensure ongoing investment, incentives, and advocacy for resilience.

How do FPA and ROAR Work in Tandem?

The affiliation between the non-profit FPA Collaborative and the for-profit ROAR Partners exemplifies a "Think and Do Tank" strategy, enabling coordinated, highly integrated efforts that would be challenging in isolation. The goal is to link our Investment Thesis, "In Lieu of Loss," with the capabilities of leading firms, consultants, advisors, and organizations – several from the Collaborative, positioning us as The Market Integrator for resilience.

Operating as separate entities—FPA for research and design, and ROAR for scaling projects—both are aligned in mission and purpose to transform resilience. Investing in one supports both, as we aim to resolve the complexities in and across insurance-reinsurance, mortgage, traditional banking, private equity, public finance, and community investment in residential, commercial, industrial, and public sector assets, facilities, infrastructure through our Future Proofing America Framework.

Works cited

1. How many disasters are declared in Maryland? - USAFacts, accessed October 23, 2025, https://usafacts.org/answers/how-many-disasters-are-declared-in-the-us/state/maryland/
2. Maryland | FEMA.gov, accessed October 23, 2025, https://www.fema.gov/hi/locations/maryland
3. 4491 | FEMA.gov, accessed October 23, 2025, https://www.fema.gov/am/disaster/4491
4. Designated Areas: Disaster 2025 - FEMA, accessed October 23, 2025, https://www.fema.gov/disaster/2025/designated-areas
5. Maryland Delegation Urges President Trump to Approve Disaster Declaration for Allegany, Garrett Counties Following Destructive Floods - April McClain Delaney, accessed October 23, 2025, https://mcclaindelaney.house.gov/media/press-releases/maryland-delegation-urges-president-trump-approve-disaster-declaration
6. Governor Moore Appeals Western Maryland Disaster Declaration Denial, accessed October 23, 2025, https://news.maryland.gov/mdem/2025/08/19/governor-moore-appeals-western-maryland-disaster-declaration-denial/
7. Moore awaits FEMA appeal decision after Western Maryland floods, accessed October 23, 2025, https://cnsmaryland.org/2025/09/25/moore-awaits-fema-appeal-decision-after-western-maryland-floods/
8. Maryland Department of Emergency Management - Origin & Functions, accessed October 23, 2025, https://msa.maryland.gov/msa/mdmanual/14dem/html/demf.html
9. Maryland Department of Emergency Management - Origin & Functions, accessed October 23, 2025, https://2023mdmanual.msa.maryland.gov/msa/mdmanual/14dem/html/demf.html
10. Maryland Department of Emergency Management - Historical Evolution, accessed October 23, 2025, https://msa.maryland.gov/msa/mdmanual/14dem/html/demh.html
11. Maryland Department of Emergency Management, accessed October 23, 2025, https://dbm.maryland.gov/Documents/MFR_documents/2025/Maryland-Department-of-Emergency-Management-MFR.pdf
12. June, 2025 - MDEM Newsroom - Maryland News, accessed October 23, 2025, https://news.maryland.gov/mdem/2025/06/
13. Tropical Storm Isaias Impacts: August 4th, 2020 - National Weather Service, accessed October 23, 2025, https://www.weather.gov/lwx/TropicalStormIsaias
14. Tropical Storm Isaias Tornadoes - National Weather Service, accessed October 23, 2025, https://www.weather.gov/lwx/TS_Isaias_Tornadoes
15. www.weather.gov, accessed October 23, 2025, https://www.weather.gov/lwx/TropicalStormIsaias#:~:text=Damage%20estimates%20at%20this%20time,in%20damages%20across%20the%20state.

16. Tropical Storm Isaias heads up East Coast threatening road, sea freight movement, accessed October 23, 2025, https://www.supplychaindive.com/news/tropical-storm-isaias-road-sea-freight-ports/582872/
17. President Joseph R. Biden, Jr. Approves Maryland Disaster Declaration | The White House, accessed October 23, 2025, https://bidenwhitehouse.archives.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2021/02/04/president-joseph-r-biden-jr-approves-maryland-disaster-declaration/
18. Billing Code 9111-23-P DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY Federal Emergency Management Agency [Internal Agency Docket No. FEMA-4583, accessed October 23, 2025, https://public-inspection.federalregister.gov/2021-05800.pdf
19. 4583 | FEMA.gov, accessed October 23, 2025, https://www.fema.gov/disaster/4583
20. MDEM Newsroom - Maryland News, accessed October 23, 2025, https://news.maryland.gov/mdem/
21. August, 2025 - MDEM Newsroom - Maryland News, accessed October 23, 2025, https://news.maryland.gov/mdem/2025/08/
22. FEMA Rejects Maryland's Flood Aid Appeal - Conduit Street, accessed October 23, 2025, https://conduitstreet.mdcounties.org/2025/10/23/fema-rejects-marylands-flood-aid-appeal/
23. Maryland uses new disaster recovery fund to support Allegany County after severe flooding, accessed October 23, 2025, https://www.cbsnews.com/baltimore/news/maryland-allegany-garrett-county-flooding-funds/
24. Billion-Dollar Weather and Climate Disasters | Maryland Summary | National Centers for Environmental Information (NCEI) - NOAA, accessed October 23, 2025, https://www.ncei.noaa.gov/access/billions/state-summary/MD
25. State Spending Series: Climate Change Costs - Comptroller of Maryland, accessed October 23, 2025, https://www.marylandcomptroller.gov/content/dam/mdcomp/md/reports/research/state-spending-series-climate-change-costs-april-2025.pdf
26. US insurance sector struck by $101 billion in weather disaster losses, accessed October 23, 2025, https://www.insurancebusinessmag.com/us/news/catastrophe/us-insurance-sector-struck-by-101-billion-in-weather-disaster-losses-553915.aspx
27. Sea-Level Rise Projections | University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science, accessed October 23, 2025, https://www.umces.edu/sea-level-rise-projections
28. What Climate Change Means for Maryland - US EPA, accessed October 23, 2025, https://19january2017snapshot.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-09/documents/climate-change-md.pdf
29. Sea-Level Rise Projections for Maryland 2023 - NASA Technical Reports Server (NTRS), accessed October 23, 2025, https://ntrs.nasa.gov/citations/20240004255
30. Maryland and the District of Columbia - State Climate Summaries 2022, accessed October 23, 2025, https://statesummaries.ncics.org/chapter/md/

31. MARYLAND - Chesapeake Bay Program, accessed October 23, 2025, https://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/25100/md-noaa_climatesummary.pdf
32. Extreme Precipitation in Northeast to Increase 52% by 2099 | Dartmouth, accessed October 23, 2025, https://home.dartmouth.edu/news/2023/06/extreme-precipitation-northeast-increase-52-2099
33. H1 2025 Natural Catastrophe and Climate Report - Gallagher Insurance, accessed October 23, 2025, https://www.ajg.com/gallagherre/-/media/files/gallagher/gallagherre/news-and-insights/2025/july/h1-2025-natural-catastrophe-and-climate-report.pdf
34. Maryland Governor Hogan Announces Howard Street Tunnel Project Advances With Final Environmental Approval - Railpace Newsmagazine, accessed October 23, 2025, https://railpace.com/maryland-governor-hogan-announces-howard-street-tunnel-project-advances-with-final-environmental-approval/
35. CSX Reopens Expanded Howard Street Tunnel Ahead of Schedule, Strengthening East Coast Freight Growth, accessed October 23, 2025, https://www.csx.com/index.cfm/about-us/media/press-releases/csx-reopens-expanded-howard-street-tunnel-ahead-of-schedule-strengthening-east-coast-freight-growth/
36. CSX Announces Successful Reopening of Expanded Howard Street Tunnel, Boosting East Coast Freight Capacity and Economic Growth - Quiver Quantitative, accessed October 23, 2025, https://www.quiverquant.com/news/CSX+Announces+Successful+Reopening+of+Expanded+Howard+Street+Tunnel%2C+Boosting+East+Coast+Freight+Capacity+and+Economic+Growth
37. CSX Howard Street Tunnel Project Environmental Assessment February 2021 - Maryland Port Administration, accessed October 23, 2025, https://mpa.maryland.gov/Documents/hst/EA.pdf
38. Challenge to Maryland Offshore Wind Project Stokes Concerns Among Legal Scholars, accessed October 23, 2025, https://insideclimatenews.org/news/16092025/maryland-offshore-wind-project-legal-challenge/
39. Top Senate Democrat Says Permitting Reform Hinges on Offshore Wind Relief, accessed October 23, 2025, https://heatmap.news/am/permitting-reform-wind
40. Quantifying the hurricane risk to offshore wind turbines - PNAS, accessed October 23, 2025, https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.1111769109

II. Maryland's Blueprint for Resilience: An Analysis of Integrated Disaster and Nature-Based Mitigation Strategies

The Chesapeake Bay Program: A Collaborative Framework for Watershed-Scale Resilience

The State of Maryland's approach to environmental mitigation and disaster resilience is anchored within one of the most ambitious and complex ecosystem restoration efforts in the world: the Chesapeake Bay Program. This multi-jurisdictional partnership has evolved over decades into a sophisticated governance structure that effectively translates high-level federal mandates into tangible, on-the-ground actions. The program's success, particularly within Maryland, is not the result of a single policy but rather a carefully constructed framework of regulation, accountability, and multi-sector collaboration that provides a replicable model for large-scale watershed management.

The Regulatory Backbone: Executive Order 13508 and the Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL)

The modern era of Chesapeake Bay restoration was formally inaugurated by a powerful federal mandate. In 2009, Executive Order 13508 declared the Chesapeake Bay a "national treasure," ushering in an unparalleled effort by the federal government to marshal its resources "to protect and restore the health, heritage, natural resources, and social and economic value of the nation's largest estuarine ecosystem".[1] This directive established a new standard of federal leadership and, crucially, accountability.

The centerpiece of this new approach was the establishment of the Chesapeake Bay Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in December 2010.[3] Far more than a set of aspirational goals, the TMDL is a historic and comprehensive "pollution diet" prescribed under the authority of the Clean Water Act.[4] It defines the maximum amount of nitrogen, phosphorus, and sediment pollutants the Bay can receive while still meeting water quality standards necessary to support aquatic life.[3] The TMDL sets specific pollutant reduction limits for the six watershed states—Delaware, Maryland, New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia—and the District of Columbia, creating a legally binding obligation for each jurisdiction to achieve its share of the necessary reductions by 2025.[6] For states like Pennsylvania, this meant committing to reduce nitrogen by over 34 million pounds per year, illustrating the significant scale of the challenge and the non-negotiable nature of the regulatory framework that drives state-level action.[7]

The Implementation Architecture: Watershed Implementation Plans (WIPs) and Two-Year Milestones

To translate the sweeping requirements of the TMDL into concrete actions, the EPA established a rigorous planning and accountability structure centered on Watershed Implementation Plans (WIPs). These WIPs serve as the official roadmaps developed by each jurisdiction, detailing the specific strategies, policies, and pollution control measures they will implement to meet their assigned TMDL allocations.[3] This architecture ensures that the responsibility for restoration is clearly defined and delegated.

The development of WIPs has been an iterative process, designed for increasing specificity and local engagement. Phase I WIPs, submitted in 2010, outlined broad, state-level strategies. Phase II WIPs, completed in 2012, built upon this foundation by providing more specific local actions and identifying partner organizations for implementation.[4] Phase III WIPs, developed after a 2017 midpoint assessment, focus on the actions needed between 2018 and 2025 to achieve the final restoration goals.[4] This phased approach allows for adaptive management, enabling jurisdictions to refine their strategies based on progress and new scientific information.

A critical component of this architecture is the use of two-year milestones. These short-term, measurable goals require both federal agencies and the Bay jurisdictions to report on their progress at regular intervals.[1] This system of frequent check-ins prevents the long-term 2025 deadline from becoming a distant abstraction. It creates a powerful mechanism for transparency and accountability, allowing the EPA, partner organizations, and the public to track whether implementation is on schedule, identify areas that are lagging, and develop contingencies where necessary.[3]

The Partnership Ecosystem: A Multi-Stakeholder Governance Model

The Chesapeake Bay Program's operational strength lies in its vast and diverse partnership ecosystem. What began in 1983 as a simple agreement between the governors of Maryland, Virginia, and Pennsylvania, the mayor of the District of Columbia, and the EPA Administrator has evolved into a deeply integrated, multi-stakeholder governance model.[8] This is a strategic recognition that restoring a 64,000-square-mile watershed cannot be accomplished by federal and state governments alone.

The partnership now formally includes 19 federal agencies, nearly 40 state agencies and programs, approximately 1,800 local governments, more than 20 academic institutions, and over 60 non-governmental organizations (NGOs).[9] This structure functions as a networked system where each partner contributes unique capabilities:

- **Federal Agencies**, represented by the EPA, provide funding, technical assistance, regulatory oversight, and leadership by example on the 5.3% of watershed land under federal ownership.[1]

- **State Agencies**, such as the Maryland Department of the Environment, are responsible for developing and implementing the WIPs that form the core of the restoration strategy.[6]
- **Local Governments** are recognized as the nexus of implementation, as their decisions on land use, zoning, and stormwater management directly impact water quality.[10]

- **Academic Institutions**, organized through bodies like the Chesapeake Research Consortium, provide the essential scientific foundation for setting goals, monitoring progress, and adapting management strategies based on the best available data.[8]
- **Non-Governmental Organizations** play a vital role in advocacy, public education, citizen stewardship, and executing on-the-ground restoration projects, from community-led initiatives to large-scale habitat recovery.[10]

This deliberate evolution from a centralized, top-down structure to a distributed, polycentric governance model leverages the unique resources, expertise, and local knowledge of a wide array of actors, creating a more resilient and effective restoration effort.

The 2014 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement: A Holistic Vision

The 2014 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement marked a significant maturation of the partnership's vision, broadening its focus beyond the singular goal of water quality to embrace the interconnected health of the entire ecosystem.[14] For the first time, the agreement included signatories from the entire watershed, with the headwater states of Delaware, New York, and West Virginia committing to full partnership.[8]

The agreement is structured around ten interrelated goals that address the full spectrum of watershed health: Sustainable Fisheries, Vital Habitats, Water Quality, Toxic Contaminants, Healthy Watersheds, Land Conservation, Public Access, Environmental Literacy, Stewardship, and Climate Resiliency.[16] Each goal is linked to a set of specific, time-bound, and measurable outcomes that provide a clear framework for action and accountability.[15] Examples of these ambitious targets include restoring native oyster habitat in 20 tributaries (10 in Maryland and Virginia), protecting an additional two million acres of high-conservation-value land, and creating or re-establishing 85,000 acres of wetlands by 2025.[1]

Progress toward these outcomes is tracked transparently through public-facing platforms like *Chesapeake Progress*, which provides up-to-date data on indicators of environmental health and restoration.[15] This outcome-oriented framework ensures that the partnership's efforts are aligned, measurable, and directed toward achieving a comprehensive vision of an environmentally and economically sustainable watershed.[12]

Public-Private Innovation in Stormwater Management: The "Smart Ponds" Case Study

The legally binding requirements of the Chesapeake Bay TMDL have created a powerful incentive for Maryland and its partners to seek more innovative and cost-effective methods for pollution reduction. This regulatory pressure has effectively established a market for environmental performance, catalyzing the development of novel solutions that outperform traditional approaches. The "smart ponds" initiative stands as a premier example of this dynamic, demonstrating how a technology-driven Public-Private Partnership (P3) can achieve superior environmental and economic outcomes in stormwater management.

The Challenge: Costly and Inefficient Stormwater Compliance

Stormwater runoff from impervious surfaces like parking lots, roads, and rooftops is one of the leading sources of the nitrogen, phosphorus, and sediment pollution that degrades the Chesapeake Bay.[5] Under the TMDL, public agencies with significant impervious footprints, such as the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT), are required to mitigate this runoff. However, the financial burden of compliance using traditional methods is immense. The standard approach involves constructing new stormwater control infrastructure, such as swales, bio-retention cells, or conventional retention ponds, at an average cost of $150,000 per impervious acre treated.[5] This prohibitive price tag, which does not even include the long-term costs of operation and maintenance, presents a significant obstacle to meeting regulatory deadlines and achieving water quality goals.

The Solution: A Technology-Driven, Multi-Partner P3

To overcome this challenge, a unique partnership was formed to retrofit existing, underperforming stormwater assets with cutting-edge technology. The project targeted three stormwater retention ponds located at Walmart retail stores in Fruitland, Aberdeen, and Hagerstown, Maryland.[5] The initiative's success hinged on the synergistic collaboration of four key partners, each with a distinct role and motivation:

- **The Technology (OptiRTC):** At the heart of the project is a cloud-based, active management platform. The system outfits standard retention ponds with sensors that monitor water levels in real time, cellular gateways that receive up-to-the-minute weather forecasts, and remotely actuated valves that control water discharge.[5] When a storm is forecast, the system automatically opens the valves to draw down the water level, maximizing the pond's storage capacity to prevent localized flooding. During and after the rainfall, it holds the captured stormwater for an extended period, allowing natural processes more time to remove pollutants—giving plants more time to absorb nutrients and allowing sediment to settle to the bottom—before the cleaner water is slowly released.[5]

- **The Private Asset Host (Walmart):** As a major retailer, Walmart provided the physical infrastructure—the existing stormwater ponds on its properties. This contribution allowed the project to proceed without the high cost and lengthy process of acquiring land and building
- new facilities. For Walmart, participation served as a tangible demonstration of corporate environmental stewardship and a way to enhance the sustainability of its operations.[23]
- **The Project Developer (The Nature Conservancy/Brightstorm):** The Nature Conservancy's Brightstorm program acted as the central project developer and manager. It assumed the comprehensive responsibility for financing, designing, building, operating, and maintaining the smart pond retrofits over a 20-year contract period.[5] This created a turn-key solution, insulating the public partner from the complexities of implementation and technology risk.
- **The Public Sector Buyer (MDOT):** Facing its steep compliance costs, MDOT served as the anchor client. Instead of building its own costly infrastructure, MDOT agreed to purchase the certified water quality improvement "credits" generated by the enhanced performance of the Walmart smart ponds.[22] This allowed MDOT to meet its regulatory obligations under the TMDL in a far more economically efficient manner.
- **The Third-Party Verifier (Maryland Environmental Service):** To ensure the integrity of the credit transaction, the Maryland Environmental Service (MES) provided independent oversight. MES was responsible for monitoring the smart ponds' performance and officially certifying the quantity of pollutant reductions achieved, thereby validating the credits for purchase by MDOT.[23]

This P3 structure effectively transferred the performance risk from the public agency to the private developer. MDOT was not purchasing a technology; it was purchasing a guaranteed and verified environmental outcome, a model that de-risks the adoption of innovation for public entities.

Quantifiable Outcomes: Superior Environmental and Economic Performance

The results of the smart ponds initiative have been transformative, delivering exceptional performance on both environmental and economic metrics. The three retrofitted ponds, which collectively treat runoff from over 80 acres of impervious surface, have demonstrated dramatic improvements in water quality.[5] Compared to their previous passive state, these "smart" systems are now discharging approximately 77% less sediment, 60% less phosphorus, and 39% less nitrogen into local waterways and, ultimately, the Chesapeake Bay.[5]

The financial advantages are equally striking. The cost to MDOT for the certified pollution reduction credits was approximately $37,500 to $40,000 per acre treated.[5] This represents a staggering 73-75% cost reduction compared to the $150,000 per-acre cost of traditional construction methods

This innovative financing model is projected to save Maryland taxpayers tens of millions of dollars while accelerating progress toward TMDL compliance.[25] Furthermore, the project delivers a critical co-benefit of enhanced community resilience. By proactively managing water levels ahead of storms, the system provides active flood mitigation, a feature not offered by conventional passive ponds.[5] This initiative provides a powerful proof-of-concept for transforming the tens of thousands of underutilized stormwater ponds across the watershed from passive liabilities into high-performing, actively managed green infrastructure assets.[21]

Metric	Traditional Approach (Publicly Funded New Construction)	"Smart Pond" P3 Initiative (Asset Retrofit)	Data Source(s)
Cost per Impervious Acre Treated	~$150,000	~$37,500 - $40,000	5
Cost Savings	Baseline	**~75% Reduction**	5
Pollutant Removal Efficiency	Variable, passive system performance	**~77% (Sediment), ~60% (Phosphorus), ~39% (Nitrogen)**	5
Long-Term O&M Responsibility	Public Agency (MDOT)	Private Partner (Brightstorm/TNC) for 20 years	22
Flood Mitigation Capacity	Passive, limited	Active, predictive control to maximize storage	5
Primary Funding Mechanism	Public Capital Budgets / Taxes	Private capital, repaid via sale of performance credits	22

Nature-Based Solutions for Coastal and Riparian Resilience

Beyond innovative stormwater management, Maryland has established itself as a national leader in the implementation of nature-based solutions to mitigate coastal hazards and restore vital ecosystem functions. Through pioneering state policy and large-scale strategic investments, Maryland has institutionalized a preference for working with nature, demonstrating that natural infrastructure can provide effective, multi-benefit protection that enhances both ecological health and community resilience.

Living Shorelines: Maryland's Preferred Approach to Coastal Defense

Faced with thousands of miles of vulnerable tidal shoreline, Maryland has proactively shifted its coastal management paradigm away from traditional "hard" armoring and toward a more resilient, nature-based approach.

The Concept and Policy Driver: A living shoreline is an erosion control technique that utilizes natural materials to stabilize the coast. Instead of a vertical bulkhead or stone revetment that severs the connection between land and water, a living shoreline typically involves the strategic placement of sand, the planting of native marsh grasses and shrubs, and sometimes the inclusion of low-profile stone sills or biodegradable coconut-fiber logs to break wave energy.[26] This approach mimics natural coastal processes, creating a resilient buffer that can adapt to changing conditions.

The widespread adoption of this technique in Maryland is a direct result of the landmark Living Shorelines Protection Act of 2008. This legislation fundamentally reshaped the coastal construction market by legally establishing living shorelines as the *preferred method* for controlling tidal erosion.[28] Under the Act, a property owner who wishes to install a hardened structure like a bulkhead must first apply for and obtain a waiver from the Maryland Department of the Environment. This waiver is only granted if it can be demonstrated that a living shoreline is not a feasible or effective solution for the specific site, due to factors like extreme wave energy or deep nearshore water depths.[28] This policy acts as a powerful market-shaping tool, creating sustained demand for expertise in ecological design and construction and accelerating the transition toward greener coastal infrastructure.

Multi-Faceted Benefits and Case Examples: The benefits of living shorelines extend far beyond simple erosion control. They create and restore critical intertidal habitat for a host of species, including diamondback terrapins, blue crabs, and wading birds.[29] The marsh vegetation is highly effective at filtering pollutants and trapping sediment from land-based runoff, improving local water quality.[27] Research shows that these systems can dissipate up to 50% of wave energy within the first ten feet of vegetation, providing robust protection while maintaining the aesthetic and ecological value of the shoreline.[27]

Numerous projects across the state illustrate the successful implementation of this policy:

- At **Flag Ponds Nature Park** in Calvert County, a partnership between the county and the Maryland Department of Natural Resources (DNR) is addressing an extreme erosion rate of over six feet per year. The project is designed to protect 500 linear feet of shoreline and create 10,000 square feet of new marsh habitat.[30]
- In the **Cape St. Claire** community, which had experienced an average of three feet of shoreline loss per year for decades, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay helped install a 970-foot living shoreline. The project, which includes two stone breakwaters, created 8,000 square feet of new tidal marsh, protecting community infrastructure while restoring habitat.[29]
- At the **West River United Methodist Center**, 760 linear feet of failing hardened shoreline was replaced with a living shoreline, increasing the climate resiliency of the youth camp's property and protecting it from increasingly intense storms.[29]

Large-Scale Oyster Reef Restoration: Rebuilding Ecological Infrastructure

Maryland's commitment to nature-based solutions is perhaps best exemplified by its massive, tributary-scale effort to restore native oyster populations. This initiative reframes environmental restoration as a strategic, multi-benefit investment in rebuilding the Bay's foundational ecological infrastructure.

The Goal and Rationale: As part of its 2014 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement commitments, Maryland pledged to restore native oyster habitat in five designated tributaries by 2025.[31] The chosen sanctuaries—Harris Creek, the Little Choptank River, the Tred Avon River, the St. Mary's River, and the Manokin River—became the focus of one of the largest and most ambitious oyster restoration efforts in the world.[32]

The scientific rationale for this investment is compelling. Oysters are "ecosystem engineers" that provide a suite of invaluable services. As filter feeders, they dramatically improve water clarity and quality; a single adult oyster can filter up to 50 gallons of water per day.[33] Their complex, three-dimensional reefs create essential habitat for hundreds of other species, serving as critical nurseries and feeding grounds for commercially important fish and crabs.[33] Furthermore, as these reefs grow vertically over time, they function as natural breakwaters, attenuating wave energy, reducing coastal erosion, and possessing the unique ability to keep pace with sea-level rise.[33]

Partnership, Investment, and Measurable Success: This monumental undertaking is made possible by a robust partnership between state agencies (MDNR), federal partners (NOAA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers), and non-profit organizations like the Oyster Recovery Partnership.[32] The scale of the public investment is substantial, with the state and federal governments collectively committing over $92 million to restore 1,300 acres of oyster reefs in Maryland's five selected sanctuaries.[32]

The returns on this investment have been remarkable and quantifiable. Maryland officially met its goal of completing restoration construction in all five tributaries in August 2025, ahead of the deadline.[32] Post-restoration monitoring has shown strong success, with reefs in Harris Creek, the Little Choptank, and the Tred Avon meeting or exceeding the scientific criteria for oyster density and biomass.[35] This ecological recovery has, in turn, fueled a stunning economic resurgence. From 2005 to 2010, prior to the large-scale restoration effort, Maryland watermen harvested an average of 116,000 bushels of oysters per year for a dockside value of about $3.5 million annually. In the five years after restoration began, the average annual harvest grew to 475,000 bushels, with the average dockside value soaring to more than $18 million annually—a more than 300% increase.[32] This powerful outcome demonstrates that large-scale investment in natural infrastructure is not merely an environmental expenditure but a potent economic development strategy that can revitalize key state industries while building a more resilient ecosystem.

Financing Resilience: The Montgomery County Green Bank Model

While large-scale public works and state-level policies can address macro-level resilience challenges, a critical component of a comprehensive strategy is the ability to finance smaller, distributed projects at the community, commercial, and residential scale. In this arena, Maryland is again at the forefront with the Montgomery County Green Bank, an innovative institutional model designed to bridge the "capital gap" and accelerate investment in localized climate resilience and clean energy solutions.

The "Capital Gap" for Distributed Resilience

A significant financing barrier often exists for projects that are essential for community-level resilience. These include energy efficiency retrofits in affordable housing, the installation of green infrastructure on commercial properties, or the development of community solar projects. Such projects are frequently too small to attract the attention of large institutional investors, yet they may be perceived as too specialized or risky for traditional commercial banks that lack tailored loan products.[36] This "capital gap" can stall the widespread adoption of proven technologies and practices, particularly in underserved communities that are often most vulnerable to climate impacts.

The Green Bank Model: A Specialized Financial Intermediary

The Montgomery County Green Bank was established as a publicly chartered 501(c)3 non-profit corporation specifically to address this market failure.[37] It is not a traditional depository bank but rather a specialized financial entity, or "intermediary," whose mission is to accelerate investment in clean energy and climate-resilient infrastructure. Its core operational strategy is to use its public and philanthropic seed funding—such as an annual appropriation of roughly $20 million from the Montgomery County Council—to "leverage" much larger sums of private capital.[37]

The Green Bank achieves this by de-risking investments for private sector lenders. It partners with local banks and credit unions to develop accessible loan products, and it can provide enhancements like loan loss reserves to make lending to non-traditional projects more attractive. By acting as a central hub, it also builds a robust local market ecosystem. It provides technical assistance to property owners to develop a pipeline of viable projects and works with contractors to ensure a well-trained workforce is available to implement them.[37] This ecosystem-building role is as critical as its direct financing activities, creating the underlying market infrastructure needed to scale these solutions across the county.

Innovative Financial Products and an Equity Focus

The Green Bank offers a portfolio of financial products specifically tailored to the needs of the clean energy and resilience market, including the Commercial Loan for Energy Efficiency and Renewables (CLEER), Commercial Property Assessed Clean Energy (C-PACE) for businesses, and the Clean Energy Advantage (CEA) loan program for homeowners.[37]

A defining feature of the Montgomery County Green Bank, however, is its intentional and institutionalized focus on equity. Recognizing that climate and disaster risks disproportionately affect low- and moderate-income (LMI) communities, the Bank has hardwired equity into its financial operations.[36] It created a dedicated fund to pair sustainability upgrades with measures that address the specific disaster risks faced by residents of affordable housing.[36] Furthermore, its first community solar project, located at Paddington Square, included a dedicated 30% subscription carve-out for LMI households, ensuring that the financial benefits of clean energy generation are shared equitably.[37] This approach represents a crucial evolution from generic green finance to a more targeted model of climate justice finance, ensuring that the transition to a more resilient future is inclusive.

Synthesis and Impact Statement: A Blueprint for Collaborative Mitigation

The success of Maryland's disaster and nature-based mitigation initiatives does not stem from a series of isolated projects but from a cohesive, multi-layered, and integrated system. Each component—federal regulation, private sector innovation, state policy, and localized finance—functions as an interlocking part of a comprehensive implementation ecosystem. This strategic integration has produced a powerful and replicable blueprint for addressing complex environmental challenges while simultaneously building economic and climate resilience.

The Integrated System: How the Pieces Fit Together

The effectiveness of Maryland's approach lies in the synergy between its constituent parts, creating a system that is far more powerful than the sum of its individual programs.

- **Top-Down Regulation as a Market Catalyst:** The process begins with the strong, legally binding imperative for action established by the EPA's Chesapeake Bay TMDL. This top-down regulatory framework creates a non-negotiable demand for quantifiable pollution reduction, effectively establishing a market for environmental performance.
- **Market-Driven Innovation and Efficiency:** This regulatory-driven market provides the essential conditions for private sector innovation to flourish. The "smart ponds" P3 demonstrates how this demand can be met by leveraging private assets and technology to deliver guaranteed outcomes that are both more effective and dramatically more cost-efficient than traditional public works models.
- **Proactive Policy and Strategic Investment:** Maryland's state-level policies and investments provide critical direction and scale. The Living Shorelines Protection Act proactively reshapes the coastal construction market toward nature-based solutions. Simultaneously, the massive public investment in oyster restoration redefines these projects not as simple environmental spending but as a strategic investment in natural infrastructure that yields significant economic and resilience co-benefits.
- **Localized Financing and Equitable Implementation:** Finally, the Montgomery County Green Bank model provides the crucial financial mechanism to translate broad resilience goals into tangible projects at the community, commercial, and household levels. It bridges the capital gap for distributed infrastructure and, critically, institutionalizes an equity focus to ensure that the benefits of this transition are accessible to all residents.

Impact Statement Summary

Maryland's approach to disaster and nature-based mitigation represents a national model of success, rooted in a cohesive, multi-layered strategy that effectively integrates federal regulation, state policy, private sector innovation, and localized financial tools.

By leveraging the Chesapeake Bay TMDL as a regulatory catalyst, the state has fostered a dynamic market for environmental performance, enabling groundbreaking public-private partnerships like the "smart ponds" initiative that deliver superior ecological outcomes at a fraction of the cost of traditional methods.

Through pioneering legislation and strategic investment, Maryland has institutionalized a preference for nature-based solutions such as living shorelines and large-scale oyster reef restoration, treating them not as environmental amenities but as critical infrastructure that yields quantifiable economic and coastal resilience dividends.

The ultimate impact is the creation of a replicable blueprint for a holistic "ecosystem of implementation," where robust policy provides direction, innovative partnerships drive efficiency, and specialized financing ensures scalable and equitable action. This integrated system demonstrates how to effectively address complex environmental challenges while building a more resilient and economically vibrant future.

Works cited

1. Strategy for Protecting and Restoring the Chesapeake Bay Watershed. Executive Order 13508 - epa nepis, accessed October 23, 2025, https://nepis.epa.gov/Exe/ZyPURL.cgi?Dockey=P100MBPD.TXT
2. Federal Strategy for Chesapeake Bay Watershed Restoration and Protection Released, accessed October 23, 2025, https://www.army.mil/article/39187/federal_strategy_for_chesapeake_bay_watershed_restoration_and_protection_released
3. Chesapeake Bay Watershed Program - NYSDEC, accessed October 23, 2025, https://dec.ny.gov/nature/waterbodies/watersheds/management/chesapeake-bay-watershed-program
4. Chesapeake Bay Watershed Implementation Plan - DNREC - Delaware.gov, accessed October 23, 2025, https://dnrec.delaware.gov/watershed-stewardship/nps/chesapeake/
5. The Nature Conservancy and Walmart Recognized With Global Award - Brightstorm, accessed October 23, 2025, https://brightstorm.org/the-nature-conservancy-and-walmart-recognized-with-global-award/
6. Chesapeake Bay Watershed Implementation Plans (WIPs) | US EPA, accessed October 23, 2025, https://www.epa.gov/chesapeake-bay-tmdl/chesapeake-bay-watershed-implementation-plans-wips
7. PA's Phase 3 Watershed Implementation Plan | Department of Environmental Protection, accessed October 23, 2025, https://www.pa.gov/agencies/dep/programs-and-services/water/bwrnsm/bay-restoration/healthy-waters-pa
8. Chesapeake Bay Program - Wikipedia, accessed October 23, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chesapeake_Bay_Program
9. About the Chesapeake Bay Program Office | US EPA, accessed October 23, 2025, https://www.epa.gov/aboutepa/about-chesapeake-bay-program-office
10. Our Partners - Chesapeake Bay Program, accessed October 23, 2025, https://www.chesapeakebay.net/who/partners
11. Chesapeake Bay Program (CBP) | US EPA, accessed October 23, 2025, https://www.epa.gov/climate-change-water-sector/chesapeake-bay-program-cbp
12. Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement Attachment One - Environmental Protection Agency, accessed October 23, 2025, https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2016-01/documents/attachment1chesapeakebaywatershedagreement.pdf

13. EPA releases 2-year milestone evaluations on Chesapeake Bay cleanup effort; cites challenges, progress and potential, accessed October 23, 2025, https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-releases-2-year-milestone-evaluations-chesapeake-bay-cleanup-effort-cites-0
14. Watershed Agreement | ChesapeakeStat, accessed October 23, 2025, https://www.chesapeakestat.com/agreement/
15. Vision - Chesapeake Progress, accessed October 23, 2025, https://www.chesapeakeprogress.com/vision
16. 2014 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement & Executive Order 13508 - DOD DENIX, accessed October 23, 2025, https://www.denix.osd.mil/chesapeake/chesapeake-bay-watershed-agreement-executive-order-13508/
17. Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement, accessed October 23, 2025, https://www.chesapeakebay.net/what/what-guides-us/watershed-agreement
18. Evaluate the success of projects by documenting the presence or absence of target fish species in reopened stream reaches or by - Chesapeake Bay Program, accessed October 23, 2025, https://www.chesapeakebay.net/files/documents/chesapeake_bay_program_goals_and_outcomes_mb_comments_2.pdf
19. Outcome Status Summary - Chesapeake Progress, accessed October 23, 2025, https://www.chesapeakeprogress.com/outcome-status
20. Chesapeake Progress, accessed October 23, 2025, https://www.chesapeakeprogress.com/
21. maryland/dc - The Nature Conservancy, accessed October 23, 2025, https://www.nature.org/content/dam/tnc/nature/en/documents/MDDC_Summer2020.pdf
22. Maryland DOT P3 Project Building Stormwater 'Smart Ponds', accessed October 23, 2025, https://environment.transportation.org/news/maryland-dot-p3-project-building-stormwater-smart-ponds/
23. Earth Day 2021: MDOT smart ponds use innovative stormwater management to help protect the Chesapeake Bay - Maryland.gov, accessed October 23, 2025, https://blog.mdot.maryland.gov/earth-day-2021-mdot-smart-ponds-use-innovative-stormwater-management-to-help-protect-the-chesapeake-bay/
24. Maryland Partners With Opti and Walmart on 'Smart Pond' Trials - Stormwater Report, accessed October 23, 2025, https://stormwater.wef.org/2019/12/maryland-partners-with-opti-and-walmart-on-smart-pond-trials/
25. Improving water quality in Chesapeake Bay – Brightstorm, accessed October 23, 2025, https://brightstorm.org/improving-water-quality-in-chesapeake-bay/
26. Living Shorelines - Chesapeake Bay Foundation, accessed October 23, 2025, https://www.cbf.org/document-library/cbf-publications-brochures-articles/Living_Shorelines011a.pdf
27. Living Shorelines - Chesapeake Bay Environmental Center, accessed October 23, 2025, https://bayrestoration.org/conservation/living-shorelines/
28. Living Shorelines - Maryland Department of the Environment, accessed October 23, 2025,

https://mde.maryland.gov/programs/water/wetlandsandwaterways/pages/livingshorelines.aspx

29. Living Shorelines - Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, accessed October 23, 2025, https://www.allianceforthebay.org/project/living-shorelines/
30. Living Shoreline Project | Calvert County, MD - Official Website, accessed October 23, 2025, https://www.calvertcountymd.gov/2167/Living-Shoreline-Project
31. Restoration Projects - Maryland DNR, accessed October 23, 2025, https://dnr.maryland.gov/fisheries/pages/oysters/projects.aspx
32. Governor Moore Announces Completion of Maryland's Five ..., accessed October 23, 2025, https://governor.maryland.gov/news/press/pages/governor-moore-announces-completion-of-maryland%E2%80%99s-five-tributary-scale-oyster-restoration-sanctuaries.aspx
33. Oyster Restoration in Maryland | The Nature Conservancy, accessed October 23, 2025, https://www.nature.org/en-us/about-us/where-we-work/united-states/maryland-dc/stories-in-maryland-dc/oyster-restoration-in-maryland/
34. Maryland Oyster Restoration - US Army Corps of Engineers - Baltimore District, accessed October 23, 2025, https://www.nab.usace.army.mil/Missions/Environmental/Oyster-Restoration/
35. Oyster Reef Restoration in the Chesapeake Bay: We're Making Significant Progress, accessed October 23, 2025, https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/chesapeake-bay/oyster-reef-restoration-chesapeake-bay-were-making-significant-progress
36. Nature-Based Approaches to Disaster Resilience Can Yield Big ..., accessed October 23, 2025, https://www.pew.org/en/research-and-analysis/articles/2025/10/16/nature-based-approaches-to-disaster-resilience-can-yield-big-returns-in-states
37. Montgomery County Green Bank — Green Bank Movement, accessed October 23, 2025, https://www.greenbankmovement.org/montgomery-county-green-bank