Slide 2: The bullets under “Adaptive Management” and “Accountability” don’t explicitly describe anything different.  In *my* opinion, a consistent problem amongst the GITs has been not understanding how these DFs will lead to adaptive management, they seem only to serve as a source of accountability and transparency for the public.  Both these descriptions include ‘documentation,’ but…why are we doing this?  How will this lead to adaptive management?  I think emphasis needs to be set on how these frameworks will lead to the adaptive management process, since currently our only explanation is that they are for documenting our decision making process (i.e. transparency/accountability), and that is not the same as adaptive management.  If the GITs still have this confusion, I don’t expect the MB to be able to clarify this with just this presentation alone. (Adam Davis, Fisheries GIT)

Slide 2: Isn’t another reason for implementing the decision framework to help the GITs work through a goal to ensure that they have assessed all the barriers, using the correct management strategies, measuring the right things, etc (i.e., GIT workgroup benefits as referenced in slide 6/7). The way this slide reads to me is that the reason for implementing the framework is more for oversight/management, not for helping the GITs themselves. (Amy Handen, Stewardship GIT)

Slide 2: Mention the NAS recommendation to improve the use of AM as one of the reasons for the CBP decision framework (Scott Phillips, DFIW)

 Slide 3: The placement of "uncertainties" at step 6 is slightly confusing. I know uncertainties are related to step 6 but it may be more clear to add to step 2 or 3 "uncertainties identified" and in step 6 to say "assessment - time-bound and related to reducing uncertainties" ? (Greg Allen, Partnership GIT)

Slide 3: In the final step, use of the word "plan" may be risky. Is this another plan that will be required? Maybe that could be "adaptive management decisions" or "adaptive management to adjust plans" (Greg Allen, Partnership GIT)

Slide 3: point six about assessment uncertainties and AM plan is vague. Suggest wording such as-6. "Assessment--evaluate progress toward goals" and 7. "Manage adaptively--short term or long-term adjustments". Bring in concept of making short-term adjustments (making changes to strategies as result of 2-year milestones) or longer-term adjustments to goals. (Scott Phillips, DFIW)

Slide 4: To be fair, I think the GIT 6 line should be yellow for the final three steps of the framework, or something other than all green for those steps. (Greg Allen, Partnership GIT)

Slide 4: Wanted to confirm that the first row for every GIT is the overarching decision framework for each GIT. We find it practical to do a df for each of the goal areas under our GIT but still need convincing that an overarching GIT decision framework is realistic, as it would be way too broad to really make an impact. (Amy Handen, Stewardship GIT)

Slide 4: The water quality GIT has too many items listed. The Bay WQ and milestone rows should be deleted because they are addressed as part of the TMDL. (Scott Phillips, DFIW)

Slide 5: maybe last bullet should be "future program directions". This will set up later slides on refining program directions and priorities. (Scott Phillips, DFIW)

Slides 6-8: Slides on Benefits look good. (Scott Phillips, DFIW)

Slide 8: Would like to add a tag related to the hoped-for implementation of a regular system of MB engagement on GIT strategy and performance. Consider a bullet such as "structure for MB support to GITs in managing strategy and performance" (Greg Allen, Partnership GIT)

Slides 11-15: Perhaps I am unclear on the objectives of this MB discussion but these slides get us into alignment and evaluation and I am not sure that is ready for prime time? I can see mentioning how the DF can be informative, such as on slide 13, but are we ready to tee-up specific questions when, for example, the Idpt. Evaluator charge has not been developed? Again, I could see this if it is in the context of DF but most of slides 11-15 don't mention the DF. If these slides remain as is, the title of the presentation should be changed to reflect the alignment and evaluation topics. (Greg Allen, Partnership GIT)

Slides 11-15: I think we are putting too much emphasis on Future Program "design". I suggest we put more emphasis on roles of the GIT and MB to carry out the DF since this is our audience for Wed meeting. So…

* I would have one slide dedicated to the role of the GIT chairs on how they will continue to implement the DF and what help do they need for operational activities and using the "bottom-up" approach to set future program directions
* Have another slide on the role of MB to implement the DF and working with GITs to identify coordination, helping GITs address challenges, forging cooperative funding opportunities, and setting future program directions.
* Have another slide on role of PSC, which would be helping with the GITs and MB issues and setting future program directions.
* Finally, another slide on role of EC and setting future program directions. (Scott Phillips, DFIW)

Other: A 'next steps' element is needed and possibly in the form of questions for the MB. We are showing on slide 4 that quite a few work groups have not applied the DF. Should the target date for completeness be the end of 2012? What are we asking the MB for relative to the presentation? (Greg Allen, Partnership GIT)

Other: We should also have a slide on next steps and time frames for the rest of 2012 and use of ChesapeakeStat to portray the information. Thanks for considering these ideas and putting together the presentation. Scott Phillips (DFIW)

General: Carl – I really appreciate you pulling this together. From the outset I thought it was comprehensive and clear and was on track with what we discussed at last week’s meeting. My only comment would be is to make the connection with ChesapeakeStat towards the end of the presentation under the ‘Future Program Design.’ I think it is important to make the connection back to ChesapeakeStat as our public tool as well as our internal tool to showcase all GIT frameworks to help us better adaptively manage. I might also add that the each Decision Framework will finally show the public how we got from point a to point b, as well as make any GAO questions/reports much easier to answer. I think these points would really resonate with the Management Board. Regards, Brent (DFIW)

General: The GIT4 Chair, Mark Bryer, is not available for the May 9 Management Board meeting. Mark and I had a conference call with Carl Hershner yesterday about our GIT4 work on the decision framework. Mark might give Carl some specific input on Carl's powerpoint. I do plan to attend the MB meeting to represent GIT4. Thanks for your work on this. (Mike Fritz, Watershed GIT)