

We recommend answering the following Adaptive Management-inspired questions in writing **and** using the “And, But, Therefore” story structure to present these points to the Management Board. **Our Discussion and Analysis Presentation Template (.PPT) should be adapted to fit your style and needs.**

What are our assumptions?

- (1) What original assumptions did we make in our Management Strategy that we felt were important to our success?
 - a. What “Factors Influencing Success” were originally identified in your Management Strategy?

There were a number of key factors identified that were going to have a key influence on our success in meeting the 300 new site goal. These including funding for the development and maintenance of public access sites, technical assistance in planning for public access site development, expanding public access opportunities on existing publically owned land, meeting the access needs of a diverse population, dealing with user conflicts, and dealing with climate change and sea level rise.
 - b. What programmatic gaps that fail to address those factors did you originally identify in your Management Strategy? The primary gap has and continues to be funding to meet the needs of developing and maintaining public access sites. Other gaps are the need for access in urban areas where shoreline development and often degraded water quality make access development difficult. Providing technical assistance to groups and NGO’s interested in developing access has also become more problematic as agency funding at all government levels has declined.
 - c. What were the “Management Approaches” you chose to include in your Management Strategy and Two-Year Work Plan in order to address those gaps? It has been important to look at existing grant programs and where feasible to include public access as one of the priorities for grant awards. This helped to leverage funding for development of new access opportunities. In the master and comp planning of public lands, particularly when older plans were revised or updated, to be sure that public access was included where appropriate. In site design, attention was placed on the potential for impacts of sea level rise and other factors that could affect sustainability over time. Tools such as Environmental Justice screening were used to help determine areas where access could be developed to meet the needs of a diverse population. In addition, multilingual signage and universal symbols were encouraged for sites where many of the users spoke languages other than English.

Are we doing what we said we would do?

- (2) Are you on track to achieve your Outcome by the identified date?
 - a. What is your target? The target for public access is 300 new sites by 2025.
 - b. What is your anticipated deadline? By 2025
 - c. What actual progress has been made thus far? To date we have added 132 new public access sites in the watershed meeting 44% or the goal. We are slightly ahead of the target of 20 new sites per year.
 - d. What could explain any existing gap(s) between your actual progress and anticipated trajectory? There are currently none.
- (3) Which of your management actions have been the most critical to your progress thus far? Why? Indicate which influencing factors these actions were meant to manage. The ability to develop

access opportunities on lands already in the public estate particularly on lands where access was included in the master plan. Another key factor has been the ability to leverage funding through grant and match programs that were available through federal and state agencies. Also the ability to develop partnerships with other agencies, localities and NGO's for access development.

- (4) Which of your management actions will be the most critical to your progress in the future? Why? What barriers must be removed—and how, and by whom—to allow these actions to be taken? Indicate which influencing factors these actions will be meant to manage. With the significant loss in funding at nearly all governmental levels, the development of partnerships and ability to share resources will be critical as we move forward. This is not only true for the development of new access opportunities but also for managing and maintaining existing facilities. Adequate pre-planning of access sites is also important so that a site can be in a position to move forward both from an environmental and budget standpoint once funding is made available. Once key barrier to both the development of new access sites and preventing the loss of those now in existence is the availability of management and maintenance funding.

Are our actions having the expected effect?

- (5) What scientific, fiscal, or policy-related developments or lessons learned (if any) have changed your logic or assumptions (e.g., your recommended measure of progress; the factors you believe influence your ability to succeed; or the management actions you recommend taking) about your Outcome? While the number of new access sites is important, more emphasis is now being placed on the quality of the sites and the types of access that can be provided. Our goal is not just sites but more new site users so that we can build on the number of conservation stewards in the watershed.

How should we adapt?

- (6) What (if anything) would you recommend changing about your management approach at this time? Will these changes lead you to add, edit, or remove content in your Work Plan? Explain. There is nothing we would likely change in our management approach. There is, however, the opportunity to consider an additional outcome and that is new access users. Specifically, engaging families and school kids in on the water activities that could lead them to become users and lovers of the resource and thus create a new generation of conservation stewards.
- (7) What opportunities exist to collaborate across GITs? Can we target conservation or restoration work to yield co-benefits that would address multiple factors or support multiple actions across Outcomes? We are collaborating with the Diversity, Land Conservation, Environmental Literacy, Stewardship and Climate teams. Public access can contribute in some form in each of these areas.
- (8) What is needed from the Management Board to continue or accelerate your progress? Multiple requests for action, support or assistance from the Management Board should be prioritized, where possible, and all requests should be “traceable” to the factors influencing progress toward your Outcome. Because a limited number of agencies and organizations are represented in the Management Board’s membership, we recommend naming those agencies and/or organizations that may play a key role in fulfilling your request for action, support, or assistance, in order to guide the Management Board in its work to contact, consult, or coordinate with partners.

Continue to support the efforts of the states and other partners in funding, development and management of public access sites. This would include appropriate staffing for maintenance as well as technical assistance in the development of new sites by NGO's and other potential partners. Also to look at ways of expanding the diversity of site users as well as the number of new users which could ultimately lead to more Bay stewards. Programs such as kids in kayaks and the Youth Conservation Corps could be good vehicles to help make this happen.