Biennial Strategy Review System: Logic Table and Work Plan

Instructions: The following Logic Table should be used to articulate, document, and examine the reasoning behind your work toward an Outcome. Your reasoning—or logic—should be based on the Partnership's adaptive management decision framework. This table allows you to indicate the status of your management actions and denote which actions have or will play the biggest role in making progress.

Some Management Strategies and Work Plans will not immediately or easily fit into this analytical format. However, **all GITs should complete columns one through four** to bring consistency to and heighten the utility of these guiding documents. The remaining columns are recommended for those who are able to complete them. If you have any questions as you are completing this table, please contact SRS Team Coordinator Laura Free (free.laura@epa.gov).

The instructions below should be used to complete the table. An example table is available on the GIT 6 webpage under "Projects and Resources".

1. For the first round of strategic review (2017-2018): Use your existing Work Plan actions to complete the **Work Plan Actions** section first. Make sure to number each of the actions under a high-level Management Approach, as these numbers will provide a link between the work plan and the logic table above it. Use color to indicate the status of your actions: a green row indicates an action has been completed or is moving forward as planned; a yellow row indicates an action has encountered minor obstacles; and a red row indicates an action has not been taken or has encountered a serious barrier.
2. **Required:** In the column labeled **Factor**, list the significant factors (both positive and negative) that will or could affect your progress toward an Outcome. The most effective method to ensure logic flow is to list all your factors and then complete each row for each factor. Consult our Guide to Influencing Factors (Appendix B of the Quarterly Progress Meeting Guide on the GIT 6 webpage under "Projects and Resources") to ensure your list is reasonably comprehensive and has considered human and natural systems. Include any factors that were not mentioned in your original Management Strategy or Work Plan but should be addressed in any revised course of action. If an unmanageable factor significantly impacts your outcome (e.g., climate change), you might choose to list it here and describe how you are tracking (but not managing) that factor.
3. **Required:** In the column labeled **Current Efforts**, use keywords to describe existing programs or current efforts that other organizations are taking that happen to support your work to manage an influencing factor but would take place even without the influence or coordination of the Chesapeake Bay Program. You may also include current efforts by the Chesapeake Bay Program. Many of these current efforts may already be identified in your Management Strategy; you may choose to link the keywords used in this table to your Management Strategy document for additional context. You may also choose to include some of these efforts as actions in your work plan; if you do, please include the action's number and hyperlink.
4. **Required:** In the column labeled **Gap**, list any existing gap(s) left by those programs that may already be in place to address an influencing factor. These gaps should help determine the actions that should be taken by the Chesapeake Bay Program through the collective efforts of Goal Implementation Teams, Workgroups, and internal support teams like STAR, or the actions that should be taken by individual partners to support our collective work (e.g., a presentation of scientific findings by a federal agency to a Chesapeake Bay Program workgroup). These gaps may already be listed in your Management Strategy.
5. **Required:** In the column labeled **Actions**, list the number that corresponds to the action(s) you are taking to fill identified gaps in managing influencing factors. Include on a separate line those approaches and/or actions that may not be linked to an influencing factor. To help identify the action number, you may also include a few key words. Emphasize critical actions in **bold**.
6. **Optional:** In the column labeled **Metric**, describe any metric(s) or observation(s) that will be used to determine whether your management actions have achieved the intended result.
7. **Optional:** In the column labeled **Expected Response and Application**, briefly describe the expected effects and future application of your management actions. Include the timing and magnitude of any expected changes, whether these changes have occurred, and how these changes will influence your next steps
8. **Optional:** In the column labeled **Learn/Adapt**, describe what you learned from taking an action and how this lesson will impact your work plan or Management Strategy going forward.

Climate Resiliency Logic Table and Work Plan (Monitoring & Assessment and Adaptation)

Primary Users: Goal Implementation Teams, Workgroups, and Management Board | Secondary Audience: Interested Internal or External Parties
Primary Purpose: To assist partners in thinking through the relationships between their actions and specific factors, existing programs and gaps (either new or identified in their Management Strategies) and to help workgroups and Goal Implementation Teams prepare to present significant findings related to these actions and/or factors, existing programs and gaps to the Management Board. | Secondary Purpose: To enable those who are not familiar with a workgroup to understand and trace the logic driving its actions.
Reminder: As you complete the table below, keep in mind that removing actions, adapting actions, or adding new actions may require you to adjust the high-level Management Approaches outlined in your Management Strategy (to ensure these approaches continue to represent the collection of actions below them).
Long-term Target: (the metric for success of Outcome):
Two-year Target: (increment of metric for success):

KEY: Use the following colors to indicate whether a Metric and Expected Response have been identified.	
Metric	Specific metrics have not been identified
	Metrics have been identified
Expected Response	No timeline for progress for this action has been specified
	Timeline has been specified

Factor	Current Efforts	Gap	Actions **(critical in bold)**	Metrics	Expected Response and Application	Learn/Adapt
What is impacting our ability to achieve our outcome?	*What current efforts are addressing this factor?*	*What further efforts or information are needed to fully address this factor?*	*What actions are essential to achieve our outcome?*	*Optional: Do we have a measure of progress? How do we know if we have achieved the intended result?*	*Optional: What effects do we expect to see as a result of this action, when, and what is the anticipated application of these changes?*	*Optional: What did we learn from taking this action? How will this lesson impact our work?*
Outcome: Monitoring and Assessment						
certainty in climate science and decision-making. How do we fully	Modeling research to	Availability of data and information to address	2.3, 4.2, 5.2			

integrate uncertainty into models and decisions to help in robust decision-making under uncertainty. How do decision-makers address uncertainty and what is the impact of that uncertainty on their decision-making process	refine uncertainty in the models	uncertainty in science and decision-making; public perception that climate change isn't happening and uncertainty in the science making decision making difficult				
Scientific Capabilities. The scientific capabilities to estimate, project, model and monitor ecosystem changes and impacts as a result of climate change are just emerging. Appropriate and accurate science and modeling are necessary for Chesapeake Bay Program partners to properly address climate impacts during policy planning and adaptation efforts.	STAC Chesapeake Bay Program Modeling 2.0 Workshop	Lack of scientific capability to monitor; lack of adequacy of downscaled climate data; continued efforts needed	2.1, 6.1			
Geographic extent/variability of the Watershed. The impacts of climate change will be varied across the Watershed. It is important to not limit the focus of the management strategy to coastal issues alone but to recognize the wide range of monitoring, assessment and adaptation needs throughout the region. However, the variability of the ecosystem within the Bay proper and the larger watershed presents challenges in data consistency and comparability among regions and sectors. The variability of ecosystems and ecosystem processes will also require different science and adaptation approaches.	Scientific data collection at MD CBNERRS sites to gain a better understanding of what is happening at the reserve level and how that can be applied to the Bay as a whole	Lack of data consistency and comparability among regions and sectors	2.2. 4.3			

mplexity of the Monitoring Program. Developing a monitoring program to detect ecosystem change and inform program and project response is a complex undertaking. Developing an acceptable monitoring approach for the watershed will be complex, and there are clear budgetary challenges associated with such long-term monitoring.	Data collected by NOAA Chesapeake Bay Sentinel Site Cooperative (CBSSC) and others that can assist with CBP monitoring efforts	Institution capacity to develop and perform long-term monitoring to detect ecosystem change	1.1, 3.1			
n-climate Related and Multiple Stressors. Overall, climate change impacts are particularly difficult to monitor and assess because they can be exacerbated by existing non-climate or human-induced stressors such as regional or localized land-subsidence, land use change, growth and development. It is often difficult to differentiate climate impacts from the impacts of other stressors. An increased understanding of these interactions is necessary to successfully access climate impacts, and the effectiveness of restoration and protection policies, programs and projects.	MDE Water and Science Administration efforts to estimate the effects of imperviousness and lack of riparian shading on stream temperature	Lack of understanding of the impact of non-climate related stressors on ecological restoration efforts	4.1, 5.1			
Outcome: Adaptation						
keholder engagement. Although there is acknowledgement that climate change and adaptation need to be addressed, there is a lack of understanding or agreement from stakeholders on what it means to be resilient or what constitutes resiliency, including what kind of actions support an adaptive	Facilitated online climate academy using Chesapeake Exploration (Bart Merrick);	Lack of collective agreement; lack of coordination among stakeholders; lack of collaboration	4.3. 5.2			

management approach. Lack of appropriate stakeholder engagement jeopardizes acceptance of choices made about action plans and implementation strategies, introducing additional levels of social discord in an already complex environmental-economic-social landscape. If social stability is reduced, then policy effectiveness would likely be reduced.						
Capacity. Institutions and the private sector have a general lack of capacity to understand the science and incorporate meaningful change into plans, programs, processes or projects. Although building that capacity is paramount, it can be time consuming and costly, considering the resource constraints faced by governments and organizations.	Ongoing Maryland Climate Change Academy and related trainings to build institutional knowledge with infrastructure executives, business leaders, municipalities and state/local decision-makers	lack of time and resources committed to building capacity to understand the science	4.1, 6.2			
Authority. Governments' and institutions' ability to respond to climate change is also limited by legislative, policy, regulatory and other authorities.	Individual jurisdictional incorporation of climate narrative (or voluntary numerical target) into WIPs III	ack of knowledge of institutional barriers; Lack of incorporation of climate change across programs	4.2			
Guidance. There is currently a lack of clear science (models, tools and metrics) and guidance for the Chesapeake Bay Program, as well as stakeholders, to use to develop plans or to measure efficacy of response. The nature of on-the-ground implementation often requires certainties (e.g., hydrology,	ongoing research and models, tools and metric development by CBP partners	velopment of clear science, tools and guidance to develop plans and efficacy of response	3.1, 5.1			

water quality, temperature, precipitation, sea level rise, coastal erosion rates) that are not yet available for a changing climate.						
ollaboration. The many and diverse stakeholders and organizations that make up the Bay Program are a strength, but it also causes collaboration challenges that must be addressed in order to leverage resources and provide consistent approaches across the watershed.	The Climate Resiliency Workgroup meets monthly to discuss a variety of climate topics; NOAA CBO engagement in the development of the NE Regional Action Plan; NOAA CBO engagement with regional partners on outcomes of Choptank Habitat Focus area vulnerability assessment	Inability to achieve consensus and provide consistent approaches	2.2			
Scientific and Technical Understanding	Ongoing CBP partner work to integrate scientific information and address technical understanding	Need a comprehensive understanding of the current science and management actions as well as availability of future climate projections	2.1			
Variable adaptation approaches. There is variability in institutional responses and the capacity to respond.	Climate Resiliency workgroup development of 7 unique climate resiliency indicators	lack of capacity to monitor long term the success of climate resiliency indicators	1.1			

MONITORING & ASSESSMENT WORK PLAN ACTIONS					
Green - action has been completed or is moving forward as planned Yellow - action has encountered minor obstacles Red - action has not been taken or has encountered a serious barrier					
Action #	Description	Performance Target(s)	Responsible Party (or Parties)	Geographic Location	Expected Timeline
Management Approach 1: Define Goals and Establish Baselines; Develop Conceptual Monitoring, Modeling and Assessment Model; and Prioritize Climate Impacts					
1.1	Utilizing the Climate Resiliency Workgroup's Climate Change Indicator Project, establish a baseline from which the Chesapeake Bay Program can monitor and assess changes in climate impacts over time				
Management Approach 2: Design Monitoring and Modeling Plan					
2.1	Consider next steps from the 2018 STAC Climate Change Modeling 2.0 workshop in conjunction with the Water Quality GIT	Adoption of improved BMP efficiencies into future WIP addendum and/or two-year milestone commitments in 2022 (Jim George suggestion)	CRWG, Modeling Workgroup, Water Quality GIT	Watershed	
2.2	Work with STAR to identify and explore opportunities to fill data gaps utilizing citizen-based monitoring networks		CRWG, STAR	Watershed	
Management Approach 3: Assess past and future trends in sea level, precipitation patterns, temperature and ecosystem response					
3.1	Stay abreast of the latest precipitation and sea level rise climate change trends and regional efforts to engage and inform Chesapeake Bay Program management and policy decisions				

Management Approach 4: Develop a research agenda to improve understanding of climate impacts or fill critical data or research gaps					
4.1	Update 2016 Compendium of Chesapeake Bay Climate Change Adaptation and Research Efforts				
4.2	Support targeted research to improve understanding of climate impacts or fill critical data or research gaps				
4.3	Keep abreast of regional partners (e.g., LCC, Climate Hubs and Climate Science Centers), academic institutions and other stakeholders activities to collaboratively define climate related science and research needs at the broader watershed-scale or within a defined geographic area.				
Management Approach 5: Undertake public, stakeholder and local engagement					
5.1	Promote the availability and accessibility of climate and other related science data and information through the development of the Chesapeake Climate Data and Mapping Portal				
5.2	Continue providing updates on relevant Chesapeake Bay Program progress and efforts through engagement at workshops, meetings and related events				

Management Approach 6: Review progress and reassess implementation priorities					
6.1	Utilize the Chesapeake Bay Program's SRS process to conduct a biennial review of the Climate Resiliency Workgroup, assess priorities and complete an updated 2 year work plan		CRWG	Watershed	

ADAPTATION WORK PLAN ACTIONS

Green - action has been completed or is moving forward as planned Yellow - action has encountered minor obstacles
Red - action has not been taken or has encountered a serious barrier

Action #	Description	Performance Target(s)	Responsible Party (or Parties)	Geographic Location	Expected Timeline	
Management Approach 1: Compile and assess current adaptation efforts and lessons learned.						
1.1	Update 2016 Compendium of Chesapeake Bay Climate Change Adaptation and Research Efforts		CRWG	Watershed		
1.2	Analyze and synthesize lessons learned, approaches, etc. across the climate change sections of jurisdictions Phase III WIPs (2019/2020)		CRWG	Watershed		
1.3	Update compiled research and resources developed in 2016 (Appendix B)					
1.4	Develop and refine outreach and communication on co-		CRWG	Watershed		

	benefits of climate resiliency					
Management Approach 2: Continually pursue, design and construct restoration and protection projects to enhance the resiliency of the Bay and aquatic ecosystems from the impacts of coastal erosion, coastal flooding, more intense and more frequent storms and sea level rise.						
2.1	Promote utilization of the Chesapeake Bay Program Climate Smart Framework & Decision support tool	Apply Climate-Smart framework in coordination with two new/additional Chesapeake Bay Program workgroups or GITs	CRWG, other GITs and workgroups	Watershed		
2.2	Revisit and assess Climate-Smart framework application to Black Duck, Tidal Wetlands, SAV and Toxics workgroups		CRWG, Black Duck, Tidal Wetlands, SAV and Toxics workgroups	Watershed		
2.3	Consider lessons learned from the 2018 review conducted b the Adaptation and Resiliency Workgroup (of?) the Maryland Commission on Climate Change's *Comprehensive Strategy for Reducing Maryland's Vulnerability to Climate Change*	Phase I: Sea-level Rise & Coastal Storms (2008) Phase II: Building Societal, Economic, and Ecological Resilience (2010)				
Management Approach 3: Increase the institutional capacity of the Chesapeake Bay Program to prepare for and respond to climate change.						
3.1	Support social marketing assessment to understand barriers to implementing living shorelines in MD, DE, and VA (GIT funding) in conjunction with the Communications workgroup		CRWG, Communication Office	Watershed		

3.2	Convene a subset of Climate Resiliency Workgroup meetings as topic specific/"themed" meetings to allow for information sharing with groups doing similar work and improve cross goal coordination		CRWG	Watershed		
3.3	Convene meeting of practitioners to share examples of climate adaptation measures for stormwater BMPs		CRWG	Watershed		
3.4	Provide guidance to jurisdictions and DoD on incorporating climate change (via climate change narrative or additional measures) into Phase 3 WIPs in conjunction with the Water Quality GIT		CRWG, WQGT	Watershed		
3.5	Investigate opportunities related to partnering on a "Chesapeake Bay Climate Adaptation Workshop" or adaptation related trainings at appropriate regional forums and conferences		CRWG	Watershed		
Management Approach 4: Implement Priority Adaptation Actions						
4.1	Work with jurisdictions to track on-the-ground projects proposed or planned by CB partners, to		CRWG	Watershed		

	be implemented within the next two years and beyond.					
4.2	Work with jurisdictions to evaluate whether on-the-ground restoration projects accommodate for climate change impacts over time.		CRWG	Watershed		
4.3	Promote the development of metrics to monitor project (identified through actions 4.1 and 4.2) performance over time		CRWG	Watershed		
Management Approach 5: Undertake Local, Public and Stakeholder Engagement & Conduct Targeted Education and Outreach						
5.1	Continue to providing quarterly newsletters on climate resiliency news, opportunities, and current efforts including policy, tools, products, and scientific understanding with interested parties		CRWG, Communications Office	Watershed		
Management Approach 6: Foster a larger discussion on the linkage between climate impacts and diversity						
6.1	Work with the Diversity Action Team to identify and pursue opportunities to create a strong linkage between the Climate Resiliency and Diversity Management Strategy.	Climate Resiliency Workgroup member to serve on the Diversity Action Team and Diversity Action Team member to serve on CRWG	CRWG	Watershed		
Management Approach 7: Track adaptation action effectiveness and ecological response						
7.1	Pursue priority recommendations from STAC workshop on BMP siting and design (2017)		CRWG, Water Quality GIT	Watershed		