

**Decision Framework Implementation Workgroup
September 21, 2012 Meeting Summary/Action Items**

ATTENDANCE:

Carl Hershner	Tim Wilke	Nita Sylvester
Beth Zinecker	Mike Mason	Doreen Vetter
Carin Bisland	Anna Stuart	Greg Allen
Greg Barranco	Lauren Taneyhill	Mike Fritz

ACTION ITEMS

4 Main Things to Do:

1. Craft two documents:

- 1) Set of questions used to educate and stimulate the MB members on the DF so that they can begin to express expectations from the top down
 - Carl may talk with Anthony Moore, Nick D, and possibly Scott P and Mark B. to enable them to raise the questions at MB mtgs
 - Pull out again the guidance to the GITs and turn into a short doc that includes q's that the above folks could use.
- 2) Provide a companion piece to the GITs so they know these q's will be asked. Craft a doc on the framework guidance between the MB and the GITs. Helps clearly define the role of the MB and GITs with the process going forward. Explained in programmatic context.
 - Eventually make this part of a strategic, routine process (e.g. when will these questions be asked and what are the expectations in terms of response from the other GITs and/or MB when they get the answers to those questions – e.g. the recent action on the “permits” issue)

2. Written publication piece for Bay Journal. Carin will talk to Karl. Others will contribute.

- Carin will call Karl Blankenship to start the discussion about Bay Journal article(s). Will also talk to Nick and how we can contribute.
- Greg Allen would be willing to take a shot at an article on potential benefits.

3. Provide input from CAC to GITs. Remind GITs that we are there to help. Follow up with GIT chairs per agreements at GIT chairs mtg (agreed to trim down and refine/clarify the GIT Goal Statements by end of Oct 2012).

- Tim check with Jessica Blackburn on full CAC response to GIT Goal Statements.
- Tim will send Pam's doc via email to DFIW (“Preliminary GIT Goals framework list”). DFIW should look at this, along with CAC notes (after Jessica sends to Tim).

4. Greg Allen will write text to help explain the hierarchy of strategy terminology including goals and other key terms. Greg wil also develop mateials showing a relationship between GIT/workgroupcritical factors and sector level critical factors. Ultimately the DF will applied to all goals, regardless of priority level.

SUMMARY

**Decision Framework Implementation Workgroup
September 21, 2012 Meeting Summary/Action Items**

- Meeting materials are available at <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/18638/>
- The objective of today's face-to-face meeting was to have a concrete plan for moving the process forward expeditiously (in order to achieve by the end of 2012 a "first pass documentation" of DF logic for all GIT goals).
- Received Updates/Reports (relevant to our future work) from the following meetings:
 - CAC (9/6-7/12)
 - MB (9/13/12)
 - GIT Chairs (9/20/12)
- Reviewed our current status working w/ each GIT and reviewed/discussed evaluation of GIT Goal Statements conducted by VIMs
 - "How well have we done what has been undertaken so far?"
 - are the goals really SMART
 - are the factors comprehensively considered
 - are gaps effectively identified
 - are the strategies well described
 - is monitoring effectively planned (outputs, outcomes, uncertainty)
 - is performance assessment planned
 - "What can we do to move the entire process forward with the December objective in mind/"
- Discussed next steps and action items for the DFIW
- The next DFIW conf. call will be October 19th (Oct 5th conf call cancelled)

DETAILED MINUTES

- Purpose of today's mtg: Plot way forward with first iteration of the goals.

Quick recap of all recent meetings (MB, GIT Chairs, CAC)

- Carin Bisland:
 - MB discussed GIT Goals and the workplan for alignment (including GIT Goals will go through the Decision Support Framework by end of 2012)
 - MB thought there were different levels of goals on the GIT Goals Statement chart and too many of them. Suggested we slim down to the biggest most important goals. MB also wanted us to identify priority goals. Separate goals from supporting goals/strategies.
 - MB also wants a hierarchy with perhaps only 10-15 "big" goals at top levels of hierarchy. They also want to know the support strategies for the "big" goals.
 - During the mtg CAC reported that there was not enough prevention focus and missing "human element" (incl toxics missing) and stream health missing from goals; missing "what we are asking program to do related to the goals (expectations for states) and has a cost analysis been done for the goals? Need clearer goals in terms of what needs to be achieved; comment about some goals aspirational and some more pragmatic.
- During GIT chairs mtg, they agreed to trim down and refine/clarify the GIT Goal Statements by end of Oct 2012.

**Decision Framework Implementation Workgroup
September 21, 2012 Meeting Summary/Action Items**

- GIT 4 chair mentioned they need to stay away from a “SMART” goal for now since they are trying to avoid any “environmental” goal. He is moving “gently” for now.
- Chairs trying to grapple if there is a core set that would be ready to move forward to EC this coming year. But not be “static” in order to allow for adaptive management. Adaptive Management needs to look at how to keep the program building, instead of setting static goals with each new agreement setting a new set of static goals. Need dynamic goals. Mentioned that we need to agree on a statement for what the CBP is but also need to allow ourselves to adaptively manage.
- WQGIT chair feels that DF documentation is a paper-work exercise that they don’t have time for and that they are already using the DF to make decisions. Nick said that even though they think they are already doing fine, they need to document that they are using the DF to make decisions since this is what CBP MB has agreed to do.
- Carl: Is there an emerging guidance we can provide to GITs to distinguish overarching (e.g mission; aspirational goal) from SMART environmental outcome goals?
- Mike Fritz: Some goals more aspirational in nature vs. pragmatic. MB wants to separate those.
- Carin Bisland: GIT chairs were grappling with that too. Are there a core set of goals that we can bring to the EC to sign off on.
- Carl Hershner: There are fairly detailed notes from the CAC breakout sessions. CAC put out a response to the goal statements. This provides the GITs an idea of how non-experts or public view the goal statements.
- **Action: Check with Jessica Blackburn on full CAC response to GIT Goal Statements.**
- CAC provided guidance in terms of better articulation of goals. There were 3 overarching observations: lack of focus on preservation in the goals; human element goals; toxics goals. Value in overarching statements of what the CBP is about but also value in ability to “evolve the goals”. Want some goals to be more fluid, but there is value to some goals that are time-bound.
 - Greg B suggested that time-bound is important.
 - Carin – time-bound for some goals was problematic.
- Carin Bisland: Communications folks said we need to be able to say why we are all continually working together in a program. Need to have communications strategy to explain each goal.
- Beth Zinecker: How much on the fly education where u able to do at the CAC meeting to teach them some?
- Carl Hershner: I purposely didn’t do a lot. There were some people who knew a lot there however.
- Greg Barranco: CAC didn’t like the idea of 10 year goal statements. What didn’t they like?
- Carl Hershner: It wasn’t necessarily time bound goals. Some are good, but there needs to be a way for the program to involve once goals are met and time goes on. New agreement will be focused on how the program will set new goals or remove/edit some goals. Need more flexibility than the program currently has.
- Greg Barranco: Why not set something like revising halfway thru like the TMDL checkpoint in 2017.
- Carin Bisland: With adaptive management it can help. The old C2K agreement had very explicating starter. By 2002 we do this; by 2003 we do this, etc. too restrictive.

**Decision Framework Implementation Workgroup
September 21, 2012 Meeting Summary/Action Items**

- Carin Bisland: A new agreement should be structured differently. Higher level, broader. More flexible and adaptive goals.

Current status working w/ each GIT and reviewed/discussed evaluation of GIT Goal Statements conducted by VIMs

- Carl Hershner: Pam also did another raw reaction to the goal statements from an outsider perspective (“Preliminary GIT Goals framework list” document). Another input in addition to the CAC response.
- **Action: Tim will send Pam’s doc via email (“Preliminary GIT Goals framework list”). DFIW should look at this, along with CAC notes (after Jessica sends to Tim).**

Fisheries GIT Update (GIT1)

- Carin Bisland: Adam and Bruce know these are due. Still trying to compile and run thru the other goals thru DF. Not sure what they are doing with the blue catfish policy. Oyster and Blue Crab will be finished being run thru DF soon.
- Carin Bisland: I am also pushing for fisheries to set an overarching goal.

Habitat GIT Update (GIT2)

- Carin Bisland: I think habitat group is most interested in using all the data meshing together. It’s more 3D than what’s on paper. Black Duck and Brook Trout are indicators of whether we are meeting our other goals and work.
- Carl Hershner: DF has 7 steps outlining the logic behind it. The outcome for the entire process is not for the GITs to fill in a spreadsheet and make it all green – it’s for the GITs to have a plan that says how they will meet goals and be accountable to those outside of the GIT.
- Carl Hershner: Trying to move everyone away from practice of setting vague goals only they understand. Would like it for the MB to be able to ask questions at any time and the GITs will be able to respond because they have all reasoned through their goals and they can readily answer that.
- Greg Allen: balance of not being over-draconian and structure, and to get the MB more involved in the role of coaching and problem solving, and having the GITs give more regular reporting.
- Carin Bisland: I keep thinking the MB’s role is focusing on the factors of the ability to meet the goals, particularly those out of the control of the GITs. Also their role should be to measure progress and make sure GITs are on track, and help GITs with any issues that are throwing them off track.
- Greg Allen: Permitting example is great example of MB’s ability to help GITs with goals. Roadblock like the permitting, etc. See how the MB can help, utilize expertise and connections.
- Carl Hershner: When setting the DF accounting for institutional factors is key. Give special attention to that.
- Mike Fritz: The expectation that the GIT will report to the MB on progress is a powerful driver. Sets in house program accountability. Very important and effective.

**Decision Framework Implementation Workgroup
September 21, 2012 Meeting Summary/Action Items**

- Carl Hershner: One thing is the development of the first iteration of the DF doesn't need to be 100% developed. The strawman argument was boiled down to 1 page. Helps outline what needs to be done under each goal.

Water Quality GIT Update (GIT3)

- Greg Allen: The first 2 were clearly goals. The 3rd is a statement that justified the previous 2 goals.
- Greg Allen: Have worked with GIT and has been vetted thru the team. For all 7 steps of the decision framework.
- Greg Allen: The next phase many of us are interested in, is how to work with workgroups – particularly those that are sector specific and are so crucial to meeting the GIT goals.
- Greg Allen: Need to determine and talk about that at the workgroup level – should we be
- Greg Allen: I tried to do some blending of workgroup factors and sector factors, and found some concern about mixed signals of what comes next? Once the paper has been worked at the top level and we see there is more activity at the workgroup level....the workgroups would like more guidance from us and need to do a better job blending the 2.
- Carl Hershner: If it's a workgroup then arguably it exists to achieve some outcome or output. A GIT should be able to measure where it's reaching that or not.
- Carin Bisland: Water quality is most resistant of changes....coordinator says they are getting mixed messages....too busy with current goals and work....many challenges of changing the culture and fundamental part of the program.
- Carin Bisland: Water Quality GIT thought they were already doing adaptive management, and see it as paper work exercise they don't have time for. Nick said well if you don't document it u can't be sure. Plus its accountability protection.
- Carin Bisland: how realistic is this mentor role – in terms of our ability to work with them to get this done. Many mentors have tons of other work they are focusing on.

Healthy Watersheds GIT Update (GIT4)

- Mike Fritz: My chair Mark Bryer has very little appetite for the group process necessary to work through this for the GIT. We probably need someone with more group process skill to do that.
- Mike Fritz: I think our overall goal decision framework has a real hodgepodge...hasn't had any whole group processing of the DF since March. In December I'm trying to convince Mark to have us focus on this and sort out priority factors during our quarterly GIT meeting in December.
- Mike Fritz: every step we are still alive doing this is a victory. PA is still playing along and the other partners agree. Unlike other GITs we don't have a EO goal.
- Mike Fritz: CAC just valued our work and option. CAC's response was partly from not enough patience for progress.

Stewardship GIT Update (GIT5)

**Decision Framework Implementation Workgroup
September 21, 2012 Meeting Summary/Action Items**

- Mike Mason: Their goals are all aspirational. They don't meet S.M.A.R.T. parameters. The conservation goal and education goal at this point are not ready to go through the DF. The public access goal is the only one that has started the process. Not sure how far they are with it currently.
- Greg Allen: The program should be managed in a way that we can clearly point to our strategies and goals, and explain how we manage the program and how we can adaptively adjust.
- Nita Sylvester: Can the FOD or FLC put pressure to have DF documentation for all EO outcomes (assuming the FLC and OMB would want to see this)?
- Carl Hershner: Can we create a list of NGOs and players that focus on this for GIT 5?
- Greg Allen: The organizational overlay is not what we would expect...MB member would want to know that there are processes for strategy evaluation and development. Their approach is unique and it may actually be working, but we need some way to be sure it's working.
- Carin Bisland: It can't just be Nick and it can't just be EPA. We need other partners to raise the same concerns. They are more likely to be listened too.

Conclude the discussion of what the strategy is going forward.

Carl – how do we move forward:

- DFIW –remind that we are here to help and provide to our GITs the input from CAC and Pam, esp related to the GIT chairs commitment to clarify their goals by end of Oct.
- Work to educate MB to put the correct pressure on the GITs (also work to educate the FOD or FLC)
 - Carl may talk with Anthony Moore, Nick D, and possibly Scott P and Mark B. to enable them to raise the issues at MB mtg
 - Pull out again the guidance to the GITs and turn into a short doc that includes q's that the above folks could use.
 - Eventually make this part of a strategic, routine process (e.g. when will these questions be asked and what are the expectations in terms of response from the other GITs and/or MB when they get the answers to those questions – e.g. the recent action on the "permits" issue)
- Provide a companion piece to the GITs so they know these q's will be asked
- Use the Bay Journal
 - Frame the questions that we'd like Carl B to ask. Carin believes should be framed in a "positive way" so that there is a sense of pride in responding to the q's
 - DFIW writes an article for the BJ related to the NAS eval and tie in the DF work that the CBP is doing (featuring "boxes" from Mike F, Doreen, Carin). And look ahead to the challenges (perhaps Nick could write that section)
 - Key elements to include in the article:
 - GIT 4 value of good metrics
 - Highlight the values of using DF for various GITs (e.g. Harris Creek example for GIT1; GIT 3 value is affirmation that they have been using DF and the future benefits for the WQGIT sector WG)
 - value to MB and anticipated benefits

**Decision Framework Implementation Workgroup
September 21, 2012 Meeting Summary/Action Items**

- Demonstrating how we are improving the efficiency of our program (in spite of hurdles that were articulated in the NAS eval.
- How can we make this process easier:
- GIT Chairs agreed to cull the list to a more manageable list of goals and actions related to what they do with the goals.
- DFIW provides the hierarchy that has emerged based on the early work (e.g. mission/aspirational goal and nested within, the SMART Goals and our outcomes)
- Provide clear guidance to GITs of what actually needs to be done between now and end of year and how we can help if they want help. Focus on the “short” list (to be completed by end of Oct) and having DF documentation by end of the year for those items.
- Carl Hershner: We still have a need to develop voices at the top of the program besides Nick. Ann Swanson, Frank Dawson, Anthony Moore, Scott Phillips.
- Carl Hershner: The other item – the idea of writing something in the bay journal, what exactly that would be and who it would target still needs to be determined.
- Beth Zinecker: Every day should be a Harris Creek day – what I mean by that is cross GIT collaboration and thought process and awareness of other GITs should happen every day.
- Carl: A piece on thinking critically about goal statements. Look at the capacity at the program level. Then talk about how this is all fitting into ChesapeakeStat.
- Carin Bisland: the challenge remaining is to look ahead and how the goals will change or adapt.
- Mike Fritz: can tie this into the GITs looking into their workplans for 2013 right now.
- Greg Allen: we should talk to the communications workgroup looking for advice.
- **Action: Carin will call Karl Blankenship to start the discussion about Bay Journal article(s). Will also talk to Nick and how we can contribute.**
- Mike Fritz: list of key elements of things we want in these articles. (based on these discussion notes)
- Mike Fritz: fundamental value of good metrics. That will get Mark bought in to this process the most.
- Beth Zinecker: We should also include commentary on potential outputs.
- Doreen Vetter: the realization that even in the most well planned efforts such as the TMDL that there are still things that can be identified and improved upon. Many adaptive pieces that can be filled in our improved.
- Greg Allen: need to see if any credibility came out of our DF effort, in terms of TMDL fixes.
- **Action: Greg Allen would be willing to take a shot at an article on potential benefits.**
- Carin Bisland: need to combat knee jerk “were doing this because we have been told we have to”. Need to talk about it as part of the bigger strategy to help better improve our work to improve the bay.
- Carl Hershner: the way I’ve spun the NAS review was a critique of the bay program.
- Nita Sylvester: big picture we are doing these things to say we have some sort of documentation by the end of the year. Timing of both of these things is critical to overcome hurdles we are facing with the GITs.
- Greg Allen: can we push for more structure on how the MB will interact with the goal teams? We need to ask when?

**Decision Framework Implementation Workgroup
September 21, 2012 Meeting Summary/Action Items**

- Carl Hershner: I see it as a multi step process. I think every time there is a MB meeting involving DF, then we want to go back to the GITs and sell it as “these are opportunities to solicit the input of the MB for help or to help your GIT address obstacles”
- Carl Hershner: any other creative strategies or ways to motive the GITs.
- **Action: Greg Allen will take a stab at a guidance document to help with DF.**
- Mike Mason: does MB care if these are SMART goals or aspirational goals?
- Carin Bisland: they are much more used to outcomes. MB is more SMART goal focused. Jim Edward would like to see both.
- Mike Mason: I think we will get so hung up to get GITs to agree on specific numbers (ex miles of stream banks, etc) Just get them to agree to aspirational goals and then focus on SMART sub-goals.
- Carin Bisland: MB wants to know which goals are the priorities and the drivers. Which ones are most important and drive the others. We need to come up with a core list like this.
- Beth Zinecker: factors influencing work.
- Beth Zinecker: I don’t think everyone knows we want a decision framework for both their workgroups and sectors.
- Carin Bisland: it’s a staff issue and a confusion issue. We need to give them more strict guidance because they are asking for us to direct them.
- Carin Bisland : they see it as a product. I see it as a process. I don’t want them to just write the report and say “ok we’re done”.
- Mike Mason: need to keep chipping away at the idea that adaptive management isn’t a onetime thing, not a flavor of the month.

4 Things to Do:

- **Craft 2 documents:**
 - set of questions used to educate and stimulate the MB members on the DF so that they can begin to express expectations from the top down
 - craft a doc on the framework guidance between the MB and the GITs. Helps clearly define the role of the MB and GITs with the process going forward. Explained in programmatic context)
- **Written publication piece for Bay Journal. Carin will talk to Karl. Others will contribute.**
- **Provide input from CAC to GITs. Remind GITs that we are there to help. Follow up with GIT chairs commitments (per agreements at GIT chairs mtg).**
- **Greg Allen will review the goals....help explain the hierarchy of goals and relationship between GIT/workgroup dynamics. Help identify key goals going forward. Ultimately the DF will applied to all goals, regardless of priority level.**
- Nita: provide clear guidance of what GITs must do between October the end of 2012.
 - Motivation for each of them to pick 1 goal.