



Management Board Meeting

June 15, 2017

Actions/Decisions

Introduction

- Action: CBP staff agreed to revise the actions and decisions from the May 2017 MB meeting and send out for review.
- Note: CBC Director Ann Swanson reported that CBC staff have been working with House members to plan a Congressional briefing about Chesapeake Bay funding on June 28 from 2pm to 3:30 pm. In addition, Senator Cardin (Md.) is planning a Senate hearing, also on June 28 and will likely be at 4:00 p.m. Details about both of these events will be provided as plans are finalized.
- Note: Habitat GITs Chair Christine Conn reported that the workshop report from the SAV Workgroup's recent Survey Design Workshop would be released on June 15. The report and its recommendations will be presented up through the Chesapeake Bay Program partnership, including briefings to the SAV Workgroup, Habitat GIT, Water Quality GIT, Management Board, FOD, STAR, and the Principal's Staff Committee. For a copy of the report contact: Kyle Hinson, (410) 267-5766, khinson@chesapeakebay.net

Recap of Executive Council Meeting and Actions

- Action: MB members agreed that the partners should submit the recently signed EC Resolution on the "Power of the Partnership", in accordance with the text of the Resolution, to the President and Congress. CBP Communications Director Rachel Felver agreed to draft the letter for the Executive Council Chair's signature.
- Note: The MB agreed it would be helpful to have the text of the resolution incorporated into the materials of an upcoming Congressional briefing.

Feedback from May 11 Quarterly Review Meeting and Suggested Process Improvements

- Actions: The Management Board agreed to the following changes to help streamline the SRS process:
 1. The Management Board agreed that GIT 6 should serve as the "lead SRS coordinator and adviser to the Management Board" and the Management Board will continue to serve as the "lead decision maker and problem solver."
 2. The Management Board agreed that Quarterly Progress meetings should be bifurcated and held over two monthly Management Board meetings.

- For *meeting 1*, GIT 6 will, prior to review materials prior to the meeting to help refine materials as well as the asks or recommendations. Any decisions or actions that can be dealt with during meeting 1 should be.
 - For *meeting 2*, GIT 6 will create and distribute at least two weeks ahead of the meeting a meeting synopsis and any refined requests for action/ recommendation. Again, MB members should consult with appropriate staff to prepare to make decisions at meeting 2.
3. The Management Board requests all materials be provided as a single package (logic tables, narrative questions and presentations) at least 2 weeks in advance of each meeting. GIT 6 will work with the Coordinators and Staffers to determine how and when they will submit materials to GIT 6.
4. The Management Board request that to improve pre-meeting preparation, workgroups should:
- Increase specificity of recommended actions and/or options (bottom line request) presented to MB.
 - Identify and refine cross-cutting themes (i.e. recommendations from multiple Outcomes).
 - Identify active members, agencies, and organizations.
 - Identify individuals and/or agencies that MB members should consult with prior to Quarterly Progress Review meeting (if known).
 - Increased collaboration and involvement of GIT Chairs.
5. The Management Board agreed to incorporate the following financing questions into the workgroups' pre-meeting narrative questions list and in the logic table if possible:
- What are the sources of outside funding that could support this work?
 - How would those sources of financing work in concert with other financing mechanisms or sources of funding? and
 - What metrics can be used to determine success?
- The MB also agreed that the goal teams should meet with the budget and financing workgroup to brainstorm on ideas about how to better incorporate financing considerations into their revised work plans.
6. To improve the Quarterly Progress Review meeting process, the MB recommends the following:
- Outcome presentation introduced by GIT Chair if possible.
 - Ask each MB member to confirm their action items at the conclusion of the Quarterly Progress Review meeting.
 - Consider incorporation of more structured, facilitated MB process (ex. red, yellow, green cards) at future Quarterly Progress Review meetings if other solutions are insufficient.

7. The Management Board agreed to allow a revised Logic Table to serve as the draft for the next two-year workplan. The SRS small group with representatives of STAC and coordinators/staffers will make the revisions to the table to help simplify them (Note: The revised table should follow STAC's intended logic sequence).

The draft two-year workplan should be provided to the MB no later than 90 days after the quarterly review is complete. Any revisions to the draft workplans will go to GIT6 for final review, recognizing that some actions will not be able to be included until partners have received approval from their management. And, there will be no second review of the draft workplans, because groups will be trusted to incorporate MB feedback. (Note: until the revised logic table is confirmed, workgroups who presented at the May MB meeting will not have to follow the 90-day timeline.)

Responding to Requests and Recommendations from May 11 Quarterly Progress Review Meeting

Stream Health

- Note: The Stream Health Workgroup is seeking a new chair and co-chair.
- Decision: Due to time sensitivity, the MB agreed to set aside \$18,000 from funding alternative to the dedicated Goal Team funding to establish a 2008 baseline and help to document progress towards their outcome. The workgroup will need to provide a written funding proposal.
- Action: Agreed to move the follow-up MB requests and recommendations from the SRS review outcomes that weren't discussed during today's meeting to the July MB meeting.

Common SRS Issues

- Note: Multiple outcome teams are facing challenges with partner participation and are interested in being part of Phase III WIPs.
- Action: Strategies to improve partner participation will be discussed first by coordinators and staffers. SRS will poll coordinator and staffers to determine which Outcomes are interested in WIPs and why they are interested. At the next MB meeting, members will review poll results.

Chesapeake Decisions Update and Next Steps

Note: Doreen Vetter yielded her presentation time with a short summary of the request that Phase 1 of ChesapeakeDecisions would support the SRS specifically by helping GITs prepare for and participate in the Quarterly Progress Meetings.

- This would involve individual interviews with the participants in the May Quarterly Progress meeting.
- The ChesapeakeStat team will evaluate the findings and present some options to the ChesapeakeDecisions Project Team for improving the experience of the Outcome leads.
- She agreed to send the MB her presentation along with bulleted talking points explaining the slides.
- Action: MB concurred that the ChesapeakeDecisions team should move forward with developing their product in support of the Quarterly Progress meetings.