

Key Elements of Management Strategies

Responder	Detailed financial information – Question: Should all partners report financial resources available as well as needs? (p.2)	Adaptive management – Should the biennial review be focused on actions achieved, environmental conditions, or both? (p.2)	Workplan scope – Should workplans be developed annually or biennially? (p. 3)	Workplan timing – Should workplans align with water quality two-year milestones? (If yes, the first workplans would be for a 2.5 year period.) (p. 3)
CBP Staff Recommendation (based on members feedback below)	Financial gaps/needs should be identified. Detailed financial information is not required, but where relevant anecdotal or high level financial information would be helpful to tell the story.	Biennial review should assess progress on actions and appropriate environmental conditions.	Biennial	Yes, workplans should align with the water quality two-year milestones.
Pennsylvania	More discussion needed	More discussion needed	Biennial	Yes
New York	Without knowing what “detailed financial information” looks like, it’s difficult to say if it should be included. If a jurisdiction has funding program(s) available to support achievement of an outcome, that could be included in the MS. A list of dollar amounts committed by jurisdiction doesn’t seem useful to us, but identifying gaps where funding doesn’t exist to support an outcome does seem useful.	The Watershed Agreement specifies the 2-year interval as the default for implementing and evaluating Management Strategies. Let’s stick to that schedule for now.	The Watershed Agreement specifies the 2-year interval as the default for implementing and evaluating Management Strategies. Let’s stick to that schedule for now.	The Watershed Agreement specifies the 2-year interval as the default for implementing and evaluating Management Strategies. Let’s stick to that schedule for now.

West Virginia	No. We think this is going to be tied directly to the gaps in some cases. The financial data is also part of annual budgets and our work plans. We need to be careful how many ways and forms CBP is requesting similar information and streamline this wherever possible. It will be difficult to provide detailed financial information that will have to be collected across state agencies and NGOs.	Environmental Conditions	Biennial	It makes sense, but it takes a lot of time to compile existing WQ two year milestones. We would need to consider additional time it will take to compile the extra Management Strategy data and to submit it within the two year milestone reports. As mentioned above we need to streamline the data and information requests.
GIT 1	Optional. This key elements document should indicate that “financial information and description should be included where appropriate”. Detailed financial information may not be available or relevant for specific actions.	Yes, adaptive management and assessments should be completed when most appropriate and relevant for each outcome rather than a fixed time frame.	Annual.	Workplans should be updated annually or as often as the GITs see fit. CBP can provide a public update/summary of the workplans at the same time 2-year milestones are reported, but the workplans themselves can be updated more often.
GIT 3	The MS development schedule does not allow for enough time to do a detailed financial analysis/assessment - this can be added in future iterations/workplans.	Focus on actions for assessing if the needed work is being done, environmental conditions to determine if that work is having the intended impact (lag times could be a factor - as they are for water quality).	Biennial	Yes

NPS	<p>Due to the numerous partners from local governments and nongovernmental organizations engaged in the management strategies, detailed financial information should not be required. Anecdotal or general summary financial information to provide sense of scope and magnitude could be included, but not detailed organization by organization budgets/contributions. Going further than this would be extremely labor intensive and problematic -- and likely of relatively little value.</p>	<p>Assessments should be for actions and/or environmental conditions depending on the specific outcome; as all of the stewardship, conservation and environmental literacy outcomes are not based on environmental conditions. In addition, adaptive management periods should not be standardized, but be based on the appropriate assessment schedule for the particular outcome (e.g. the 5 year forest canopy case).</p>	<p>Biennial. Annual would necessitate far too much time spent in planning rather than doing.</p>	<p>They could be aligned with 2 year milestones if it is generally convenient for scheduling purposes. However, it is important to remember there is not any direct correlation between a number of outcomes and water quality milestones.</p>