**DFIW 11-2-12 MEETING MINUTES**

Attendance:

* Anna Stuart (phone)
* Beth Zinecker
* Carin Bisland
* Carl Hershner
* Doreen Vetter
* Greg Barranco
* Mike Mason (phone)
* Pam Mason
* Tim Wilke

Notes:

* **SAV WORKSHOP DISCUSSION:**
* Carl: Appropriate acreage goal. They used DF as a construct and model for their acreage goal. They created a 5 pager for that and we encouraged them to further refine it to a 1 pager. It was a great example of DF in action. Lee will revisit the current document into a 1 pager, and try and incorporate my discussion with him.
* Carin: SAV habitat is enshrined in regulation. SAV acreage is not.
* Carin: part of the reason it is habitat is due to the practical problems of acreage. They can measure if habitat standards are being met. Can’t guarantee the SAV will grow.
* Carin: people are feeling intimidated by the rigorousness they perceive the decision framework to be.
* Beth: They pulled pieces out of their strategy document to create the 5-pager.
* Carin: From my understanding they were developing their strategy and decided to use the DF as guidance. That’s something ideally we want all the GITs to do going forward.
* Carl: Need GITs to identify gaps such as knowledge gaps for some goals or outcomes (such as SAV).
* Carl: we have been struggling to convey that for awhile but we could try using analogies. (ball room dancing analogy…you can go through the steps but you can’t win the championship unless you can actually demonstrate and understand them in a live situation)
* Carl: the 1 pager was the only thing we needed to go forward (not the whole in depth 5 pager) from GITs. The decisions being made at MB and PSC levels should be able to work off of a shorter document that captures the bigger pictures.

**ACTIONS & DECISIONS SUMMARY:**

* Action #1: Carl & Carin will collaborate on contacting the Chesapeake Bay Journal.
* Action #2: Carl & Pam will develop a strawman argument for each Goal Team, and distribute to DFIW members no later than November 9th.
* Action #3: Carl will lead with the development of a backgrounder and presentation highlighting parts of the DF most important/relevant to MB members. (target date January 10th MB meeting)
* Action #4: Carl will lead with the development of a backgrounder and presentation highlighting parts of the DF most important/relevant to GIT members. (target date January 10th MB meeting)
* Action #5: Carin & Carl will try to individually coach select members of the MB to ensure active vocal participants during the meeting. (target date January 10th MB meeting)
* Action #6: DFIW members send comments by November 5th and Carl will come back to us by November 8th.
* Action #7: Greg Barranco will send Carl suggestions for effective format for MB presentation.
* Action #8: Greg Barranco will email his poster used in Tampa to Carl as an example for a potential adaptive management poster.
* Action #9: DFIW members should try to collaborate with other “programs” and see how they are doing adaptive management. Puget Sound, San Fran Bay, etc. Bring any useful insights back to the group.

**CONTEXT SUMMARY:**

* Carl: set of small items to help them understand the strategies being pursued. Will help them understand why the strategies identified make sense for their goals. That’s what we would like the GITs to seek in all of this. (context for Action #4)
* Carin: what also really resonates with the MB is the “factors influencing the goal” that helps break down what is within the control of the GIT and what is out of their control. (content for Action #3)
* Beth: one way to appear more neutral is an interview with 2-3-4 people that include MB members and GIT chairs. (context for Action #1)
* Carin: in order to truly do adaptive management, 2 year milestones, midyear assessments, etc. Check-in points and how we use them to re-evaluate is key. This topic could be a good op-ed piece. (context for Action #1)
* Carl: we could start with the least problematic approach to go in the bay journal. The interview type of process. (context for Action #1)
* Carl: Carl and Pam will go back and redo all of the goal teams and determine which one is the most complete that can serve as a “primary example” (context for Action #2)
* Beth: why not break down this paper and break it down into what is the SAV workgroup. What it would look like. And then build on others. Have 1 fully run thru example/case study of the template in action. Bullet from. Written form. Presentation form. (context for Actions #3 & #4)
* Greg Barranco: For me there’s a missing piece in the first step of the DF. Going from articulating goals to implementing. We are missing the background piece. Baseline information. We need this. (context for Action #3 & #4)
* Greg Barranco: I’d like to put this current “where are we” and background piece in the template we send to the MB members. A baseline/problem statement. We have had issues with crab populations historically because XYZ” (context for Action #3 & #4)
* Carin: EO had a 1 pager baseline/backgrounder on some of the issues. (context for Action #3 & #4)
* Carin: the baselines may have been revised but the “why” or may not have been updated. (context for Action #3 & #4)
* Pam: as for the rationales. It appears those are still being formed within the program NOW. Still in development. (context for Action #3 & #4)
* Carl: the other things we need to make progress on is on the guidance document/template for the MB, and the Bay Journal piece. Will have that circulating next week. (context for Action #1)
* It’s a sensitive and political issue and I am keenly aware of that. (context for Action #1)
* Greg Barranco: why now? What is so key about doing a bay journal article at this time? (context for Action #1)
* Carl: originally it was to adaptively manage ourselves and set a goal publically. (context for Action #1)
* A bay journal article could be leverage. Could cause internal pushback however (context for Action #1)