

WQGIT Near-Term Milestones

Extravaganza Feedback

LINK TO EDIT

<https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1f-PWDNdhoQbULqFmNJlb30Ta5YGc5KK9UWLMyTgZMoA/edit?usp=sharing>

1 Year Pros vs Cons (add your own points below!)

Pros

- Allows for multiple rounds of milestones to experiment with

Cons

- Too short to show sufficient learning, change, or progress
- **Too burdensome/resource intensive to develop new milestones each year**

2 Year Pros vs Cons (add your own points below!)

Pros

- Maintains EC commitment
- Second round concludes post Phase 7 targets while not interfering with future planning approaches
- 2 cycles of milestones allows consideration of Beyond 25 Phase 2 work, adaptive management, and adjusting sandboxing ideas
- Depending on timing, perhaps provides some accountability for EC members and representatives for signatories to the Watershed Agreement

Cons

- Not a change
- Two years may not be enough time to demonstrate change or progress
- With the current process (Mid point assessment) it's almost like annual MS anyways. **So maybe remove that mid-point assessment.**

3 Year Pros vs Cons (add your own points below!)

Pros

- Responsive to partners' request that 2 years is too short to show progress
- Allows more time to document progress
- Long enough to utilize innovation but short enough to course correct if the innovative approach is not working
- 3 years will give us enough time to learn from Beyond 2025 implementation and move forward. We can't afford to spend the amount of time on milestones more often than that.

Cons

- MS period would conclude right as Phase 7 targets are established. Could be long term and short-term planning at the same time
- Could limit opportunities to amend sandboxing ideas (1 round of milestones as basis)

4 Year Pros vs Cons (add your own points below!)

Pros

- Timing concludes post Phase 7 targets while not interfering with future planning approaches
- Could encourage larger scale commitments
- Could also allow for mid-point assessment

Cons

- Could limit opportunities to amend sandboxing ideas (1 round of milestones as basis)
- Challenges with anticipating future budgets to support certain commitments

5+ Years Pros vs Cons (add your own points below!)

Pros

- Allows more time to demonstrate progress or change for longer term program changes
- Could encourage bigger scale commitments from partners
-

Cons

- Concerns timing is too long prior to status update
- Gets away from EC intent for more frequent updates (i.e. checkpoints with more incremental progress and time to adapt)
- **Challenges with anticipating future budgets to support certain commitments**
- **Created/developed during one administration to be implemented/concluded by another**
- Harder to defend in the public sphere

Brainstorming (add your own ideas below!)

- This is a sample idea
- Include a “gap year” between cycles
 - Pro: Allows time for evaluation/reflection on progress; Con: Risks loss of momentum
- Propose consideration of policy BMPs in milestone considerations- currently these BMPs do not receive credit in CAST and are used for planning purposes only- consideration of jurisdictional conservation policy BMPs would bring a more holistic approach to acknowledging the states’ efforts in these areas
- Maybe we should consider programmatic and numeric milestones separately so that we can establish different MS frequencies that make it easier to track?
- We also talked about different milestones (and expectations for achievement) for Watershed Agreement goals and outcomes vs. innovation or sandboxing
- EPA shouldn’t have the right to determine if innovations need to be continued/adapted if they don’t work or have support of the sponsor.
- Can actions to advance and demonstrate accountability on EC Directives also be reported in the milestones?
- There have been discussions of promoting innovative approaches but not having the same accountability for innovation (what if trying something new doesn’t work...). Not sure milestones are the appropriate vehicle for promoting innovation, but it is worth considering.
- We need to understand if changing the frequency for federal agencies would need approval by the FLC or others.
- Propose "initiate sandboxing approaches" as milestone. Could we say "initiate sandboxing approach in this part of the watershed, etc." as a milestone

Case for Milestones Pros vs Cons (add your own points below!)

Pros

- EC Accountability (a necessary recap during annual meetings?)
- Establishes accountability, not from the Accountability Framework perspective but for jurisdictions to the public, to EPA and to legislatures. It also establishes a framework and commitments for legislatures to fund.
 - ^Valuable as a resource/reference for communicators
-

Cons

- Current exercise may not currently meet intent, has become paper exercise