Objectives: Get feedback on proposed "strategic science and research framework" so process can move forward.

Session leads: Brian Benham (STAC) and Scott Phillips (STAR); Kirk Havens as facilitator, being contacted by Kristin

Draft: updated Feb 28

Part 1: Overview of Proposed Strategic Science and Research Framework: Scott Phillips and Emily Trentacoste

- Need for the framework, what we have heard some GITs, STAC, and MB: Scott
- Proposed approach, how the information will be used, and opportunities for resources to address the science gaps: Scott
- Examples of science needs gathered from the Goal Teams: Emily
- Discussion questions:
  - General feedback on framework – e.g. right format? Timeline? Adequate at capturing needs? What should the evolving or non-evolving products of framework be (needs list, framework document, biannual document, etc.)?
  - Are there suggested modifications that should be considered for the framework?

Part 2: Integrating fundamental science based on STAC workshop reports and input: Brian Benham and Bill Ball

- Perspectives on strategic science and research framework: Brian or Bill
- Examples of existing science recommendations from STAC workshops: Rachel or Bill
- Getting input of STAC: longer-term process needed over the next year: Brian
- Discussion questions:
  - How do we best take advantage of existing STAC recommendations from workshop reports for developing initial framework document (due summer 2019)
  - Should we focus on STAC workshops done since Watershed Agreement, that address specific goals and outcomes of agreement?
  - What is the best approach for integrating longer-term STAC input (expected in 2020)?

Part 3: Assessing existing science efforts, identifying remaining science gaps, and developing recommendations to fund gaps. Emily Trentacoste and Brian Benham

- Overview of resource assessment and identifying remaining gaps: assessing current efforts to address science needs and illustrating remaining gaps: Emily.
- Three examples will be provided that have varying amounts of resources to address science gaps"
  - Initial assessment of current science efforts to address GIT needs for fish habitat assessment: Scott Phillips
  - Identifying BMPs to address nitrogen from groundwater: Brian Benham
  - Prioritizing climate science needs and assessment of existing resources. Mark Bennett.

Discussion questions

- Are we missing science providers to look for resources?
- Are there any suggestions on how to go about the remaining resource assessment?
- Are there suggestions on how to keep the assessment up-to-date as things change?

Concluding Panel: Questions from the audience on all topics: Brian, Emily, and Scott, with facilitator. Types of questions we want to pose to the audience could include:

- How should recommendations be prepared to better align partner science efforts?
- How do we balance operational science (short term) with fundamental science (longer term)?
- How should we work together to prioritize needs that have gaps in resources on a bi-annual basis?
- What do we do with those priorities (e.g. provide bi-annual needs to science providers)?
- How can the MB and this community help find and align resources for needs with gaps?