# June 15, 2017 Management Board Meeting
# <u>DRAFT</u> Agenda Items Regarding Quarterly Progress Meeting
## June 1, 2017

**<u>PART 1:  IMPROVING THE SRS PROCESS</u>**

**<u>Enacting the Decision Framework: Adaptive Management and the Quarterly Progress Meetings</u>** (Carl Hershner and Kirk Havens, STAC members, 45 minutes**)**

**Feedback from May 11 Quarterly Progress Review Meeting and Improvements for Discussion** (30 minutes)
<u>Brief</u> *review of major comments (both positive and negative) from the first Quarterly Progress Review Meeting on May 11.  Comments collected from MB survey immediately after May 11 meeting, GIT 6 (May 16), coordinators and staffers (May 18), Cross-GIT meeting (May 30), and any others.  Presentation of compiled comments followed by proposed options/paths forward and targeted discussion with MB to ensure we are not missing anything and any immediate response.*

- Need to facilitate better preparation → Provide coordinators and staffers a revised timeline of due dates and relevant meetings and have GIT 6 and MB confirm SRS group's role as "lead systems integrator" (working on behalf of GIT 6)
- Financial questions missing from discussion → Include finance questions in discussion guide (either as part of the instructions of how to fill out the logic table, and/or as a factors influencing appendix)
- Continued support from GIT 6 and STAR is needed → GIT 6 can continue to coordinate this support and offer pre-meetings with interested Outcome teams for review and feedback of presentations.
- MB did not have the time to make substantive decisions during the Quarterly Progress Meeting – either there was not enough time for discussion, or they needed to consult with other staff who were not present.  →
    1. GIT 6 to review "asks" in advance,
        o  work with teams to make as specific as possible (including options if appropriate) and to make sure the criticality of the asks and the consequences of not following through on asks are made clear,
        o Make sure asks are really where the MB through the "partnership" can add value
        o  identify cross-cutting items,
        o  identify key individuals/agencies that should be present, and
        o distribute all this to MB in one, brief document prior to Quarterly Review Meeting (Kara's template).
    2. Increase lead time for PowerPoints (1 week in advance to the MB)
    3. Encourage MB members and GIT coordinators/staffers to either reach out to or provide suggestions of decision-makers they may need that do not normally attend the MB meetings
    4. Consider a facilitated decision-making process
        o Red, yellow, green cards for MB members to use during the "asks" portion
        o Works best with "asks" that have options for action(s) attached to them
    5. Ask each MB member to identify actions they will take at the end of the Quarterly Review Meeting.

6. One of the following:
   o Conduct a MB webinar or conference call that identifies and explains the "asks" in advance of the Quarterly Progress Review Meeting
   o Hold the Quarterly Progress Review Meeting over a 2-day period
   o Spread the Quarterly Progress Review discussion over 2 monthly MB meetings
   o Others?
7. Discussion question: Where the right decision-makers present at the May 11 meeting? If not, how can we get them there at future meetings?

▪ In some cases, did not seem like an effort of an entire goal team but rather of a coordinator and a staffer →
   1. Have GIT Chairs introduce presenters during Quarterly Review Meeting.
   2. Encourage GIT chairs to take on a role in collaborating on common problems and offering recommendations
▪ Participation was an issue common across the GITs that presented → GIT 6 can hold discussion on what it means to be an engaged GIT and workgroup member
▪ Not all attendees had a common understanding of the adaptive management process and the role the logic tables played in facilitating that thinking → STAC members to discuss at MB meeting (already occurred in this meeting!) and GIT 6 to revise and redistribute governance document
▪ Need for more collaboration among GITs → Encourage GITs and workgroups to ID common themes and shared asks ahead of time, offer recommendations on how to address challenges and solve problems, and present this to MB as a problem-solving discussion. (Potential venues: GIT 6 and Coordinator/Staffer meetings)


**PART II:  ACTION ITEMS FROM MAY 11 QUARTERLY PROGRESS REVIEW MEETING** (1 hour)
**Requests from Goal Teams:**
Healthy Watersheds:
- Consistent partner participation
- Pathway to communicate tools and information to planners and watershed organizations (2-way)
- Monitoring and assessment of healthy watersheds
   o Inclusion in the Watershed Implementation Plans (WIPs)

Protected Lands:
- Support and effectively credit land conservation in the updates to the Bay models and Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) by creating strong incentives going forward for:
   o The placement of science appropriate BMPs on permanently protected lands, and
   o The permanent protection of large landscapes of resource lands from conversion in combination with other possible measures

Stream Health:
- Active leadership and involvement in accomplishing biennial workplan tasks
   o New co-chairs
   o Staff performance plans
- Funding to establish the 2008 baseline and document progress towards Outcome
   o $18K requested

Brook Trout:
- Incentives for Team Members to be more engaged and invested in the Outcome

- Pathways for communication/outreach with key decision-makers/planners to increase awareness/opportunities
- Support for cross-GIT collaboration, monitoring programs

Fish Habitat:

- Incorporate fish habitat into the Phase III Watershed Implementation Plans
  - Prioritize Best Management Practices (BMPs) that address water quality and habitat
  - Serve as a metric of progress

Fish Passage:

- Dam removal incentive programs
  - Ex. Tax deductions for dam owners that opt to remove dams that produce significant ecological benefits
- State dam safety offices to consider ecological harm/impacts due to dam failure in addition to public safety concerns
  - Better coordination within state agencies to encourage removals when appropriate

**Common Asks from presentations:**

- Stronger participation/engagement from team members
- Incorporation into WIPs
  - Ensure that WIPs encourage efforts that look beyond water quality
  - Prioritize BMPs that have additional ecosystem benefits
- Support and help in communicating the value of these outcomes to community

**Refined Asks – Things to Consider:**

- What have you tried so far? What has worked, what hasn't?
- What are your recommended option(s) for moving forward?
- What exactly would you like to see included in the WIPs that would help you achieve your outcome(s)?
- If you are having participation issues, who are the exact agencies and/or people you need to be at the table?
- What actions can the members of the MB (at the table) take to fulfill these asks?
- What kind of incentives would you suggest to improve partner participation?
- If your ask is not fulfilled, in what way(s) will these impede you from meeting your outcome(s)? I.e. Why is this a critical ask?
- Why do you need this? Keep asking why until you get to the base level of the issue/ask
- -Others?