BIENNIAL STRATEGY REVIEW SYSTEM
Chesapeake Bay Program

Logic and Action Plan: [Pre- OR Post-] Quarterly Progress Meeting

EXAMPLES for completion of 5th and 6th columns

[Insert Outcome Name] – [Insert Appropriate Years here] *[NOTE: make sure to edit **pre**- or **post**- in the text above, to tell the reader whether this logic and action plan is in preparation for your quarterly progress meeting or has been updated based on discussion at the quarterly progress meeting.]*

Long-term Target: (the metric for success of Outcome)
Two-year Target: (increment of metric for success)

Instructions: Before your quarterly progress meeting, provide the status of individual actions in the table below using this color key.
Action has been completed or is moving forward as planned.
Action has encountered minor obstacles.
Action has not been taken or has encountered a serious barrier.

Additional instructions for completing or updating your logic and action plan can be found on ChesapeakeDecisions.

Factor	Current Efforts	Gap	Actions	Metrics	Expected Response and Application	Learn/Adapt
What is impacting our ability to achieve our outcome?	*What current efforts are addressing this factor?*	*What further efforts or information are needed to fully address this factor?*	*What actions are essential (to help fill this gap) to achieve our outcome?*	*What will we measure or observe to determine progress in filling identified gap?*	*How and when do we expect these actions to address the identified gap? How might that affect our work going forward?*	*What did we learn from taking this action? How will this lesson impact our work?*
Example #1: Fish Passage						
Jurisdictional Priorities: Policy maker understanding of the ancillary benefits of dam removal.	Conversations with jurisdictional dam safety officials to educate on benefits of removing failing dams vs repair of failing dams.	Lack of recognition and resulting policies and regulations that dam removal has greater habitat benefits than dam repair	Action 1.1.: Conduct and compile literature search of scientific support for habitat benefits of dam removal (and lack of negative impacts of sediment	Number of jurisdictions that changed policies and/or regulations to give preference to removal of failing dams vs repair of failing dams.	Within 2 years of policy and regulatory changes, an additional 200 miles of stream habitat (wastershed-wide) will have been opened to fish	

			release) and examples of dam removal policies elsewhere in nation. Action 1.2: Prepare jurisdiction-specific recommendations based on literature search for policy/regulatory changes. Action 1.3: Hold jurisdiction-specific meetings with dam safety and natural resource officials to seek policy and regulatory changes to give preference to dam removal vs repair.		passage due to dam removals that otherwise would have been dam repairs with no resulting increase in fish passage.	
Example #2: SAV Restoration						
SAV Logic & Action Plan **Partner Coordination:** SAV Restoration	CBP partners engage in small-scale restoration activities annually (Md DNR, VIMS, local watershed organizations) both for the benefits of direct planting and for citizen outreach efforts.	Science behind appropriate restoration techniques and site selections models are constantly evolving and the most effective techniques aren't necessarily used.	Action 3.1: Identify available and appropriate SAV restoration site selection models. Models should incorporate long-term habitat quality data, including water temperature, salinity and water clarity measures. Action 3.2: Continue SAV restoration efforts through direct plantings of seeds or propagules in hopes of establishing viable SAV beds where they are not recovering naturally or adding diversity	SAV restoration areas identified based on useful model outcomes *[Restoration areas identified by the model is an output of the model but did using the new information in restoration planning improve SAV restoration success?]* Creation of SAV restoration protocol and fact sheets. Acres of SAV mapped, reported.	X% improvement of SAV recovery success over X time in areas planted using the model output & the information provided by the restoration protocol fact sheets and the understanding obtained from the direct plantings	

			to existing SAV beds, to further our understanding of site selection criteria, and as an outreach and education tool for citizen stewardship involvement (see MA IV).	*[Creation of SAV restoration protocol and fact sheets and acres of SAV mapped is an output. The question is did that information improve restoration success and result in an increase in SAV mapped?]* The proportion of restoration decisions improved by the new information.		
Example #3: Stream Health						
Stream Health Logic & Action Plan **Policy and Administrative Factors:** Cumbersome and lengthy stream restoration project permit review processes across watershed	Stream Restoration Permit Committee: Preparing survey to assess progress and need to improve permit process and project outcomes related to functional lift.	Lack of coordination necessary to streamline restoration project permit process.	Action 3.1: Develop a "Stream Restoration Permit Committee" of the Stream Health Work Group that brings practitioners, regulators and the regulated community together to resolve issues and find common ground to identify actions to streamline the stream restoration project permit review process	Accelerated stream restoration across the watershed due to streamlined permitting processes	X% reduction in the time to issue a restoration permit by 20XX.	