


ARE YOU SUPPORTIVE OF THE OUTCOME LANGUAGE?



IF YOU SAID YES WITH RESERVATIONS, WHY?

No reservations


n/a



2



ARE YOU SUPPORTIVE OF THE TARGETS?



IF YOU DISAGREE, WHY? ANY THOUGHTS WELCOME

Target 1 is very broad and may be difficult to track. We may need to put guardrails on it.

Exactly Julie, I rated the nature based one lowly because I don't think the Bay Program can control the implementation of strategies unless we suddenly had cabinet secretaries sitting on the CRWG

For seven focus areas, consider using subwatershed areas?


Increase the resilience knowledge of those implementations the projects, but don't specify the projects themselves.

Target 3, while important, relies on conducting evaluation of implementation and development of metrics. How would this work if we cannot ensure implementation?

To help with tracking, aybe you could generate a list of strategies or projects that apply. Then you could also apply a weighted scale to those. I.e. a big living shoreline compared to a rain garden.

By XX, partners in reg focus areas will track/report nature-based implementation thru: documentation of strategies used in project planning, annual summaries, shared lessons on effective approaches?

If the target is to share resources and knowledge, especially as it pertains to TA, is there an interest in working with the LLWG?



IF YOU DISAGREE, WHY? ANY THOUGHTS WELCOME

Target 3 will likely require external funding and collaboration with researchers.

Target 3. "Guidance" to me also means research that informs this. I expect that research will be occurring.



8



ANYTHING YOU WOULD CHANGE ABOUT THE INDICATORS?

#plans and project designs is very broad - consider narrowing to partner organizations. Need to ensure there isn't double counting from funded and regulatory sides.

I think it's hard to measure what the Bay Program is adding value to, versus what is happening anyways. We shouldn't take credit for what would have existed anyways or vice versa. Expectations setting

Will these indicators be identified and reported "as a workgroup" or by individual jurisdictions? I think they are fine by workgroup but may be difficult for jurisdictions to track

Maybe an indicator that counts influence on other workgroup's goals

Could perform a pilot or collaborative review first in certain focus areas that could trial the metrics and refine based on feasibility and capacity

To track, can it be teased out of projects/BMPs that are already being reported for the TMDL?

"Resilience effectiveness" might be clearer if described as risk reduction and habitat gains or something similar