

Credits

Project Coordinators

Beth Huning, San Francisco Bay Joint Venture, bhuning@sfbayjv.org

Brady J. Mattsson, lead developer of report, lead decision analyst, independent contractor, brady.mattsson@gmail.com

Christina Sloop, San Francisco Bay Joint Venture, current affiliation: Blue Earth Consultants

Project Advisors

Giselle Block, decision analyst for Suisun team, Inventory & Monitoring Program, National Wildlife Refuge System, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, giselle_block@fws.gov

Jonathan Cummings, decision analyst for Central Bay team, Vermont Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit, US Geological Survey (USGS)

Will Murray, meeting facilitator, independent contractor

Kelly Robinson, decision analyst for North Bay team, New York Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit, US Geological Survey (USGS)

Participants and stakeholders

Joy Albertson, US Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS), SF Bay National Wildlife Refuge Complex

Donna Ball , Save the Bay

Grant Ballard, Point Blue Conservation Science

Valary Bloom, USFWS, Ecological Services

John Bourgeois, State Coastal Conservancy, South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Program

Catherine Burns, San Francisco Bay Bird Observatory

Cecille Caterson, CA State Parks

Steve Chappell, Suisun Resource Conservation District

Tim Doherty, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Rebecca Fris, CA Landscape Conservation Cooperative

Brian Fulfrost, Brian Fulfrost and Associates

Matt Gerhart, CA State Coastal Conservancy

Participants and stakeholders, continued

Letitia Grenier, CA State Coastal Conservancy

Andy Gunther, Bay Area Ecosystem Climate Change Collaborative

Judy Kelly, SF Estuary Partnership - Association of Bay Area Governments

John Klochak, USFWS Coastal Program

John Krause, CA Dept. Fish & Wildlife

Marilyn Latta, CA Coastal Conservancy

Roger Leventhal, Marin County Public Works

Javier Linares, USFWS

Meg Marriott, USFWS, San Pablo Bay National Wildlife Refuge

Julian Meisler, Sonoma Land Trust

Anne Morkill, USFWS, San Pablo Bay National Wildlife Refuge

Nadav Nur, Point Blue Conservation Science

Peggy Olofson, Invasive Spartina Project

Leo Salas, Point Blue Conservation Science

Barbara Salzman, Marin Audubon

Stuart Siegel, Siegel Environmental LLC

Renee Spenst, Ducks Unlimited

Karen Taylor, CA Dept. Fish & Wildlife

Rachel Tertes, USFWS, San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge Complex

Karen Thorne, US Geological Survey (USGS), Western Ecological Research Center

David Thomson, San Francisco Bay Bird Observatory

Laura Valoppi, USGS South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Program

Susanne von Rosenberg, Gaia Consulting

Mike Vasey, San Francisco Bay National Estuarine Research Reserve

Jordan Wellwood, Richardson Bay Audubon

Bruce Wolfe, SF Bay Regional Water Qual. Board

Greg Yarris, Central Valley Joint Venture

DETAILED TABLE OF CONTENTS

Credits..... 2

Preface..... 15

How to use this report..... 16

Detailed summary 17

Motivation 17

Bayland-wide framework for conserving the SF Bay Estuary 19

Components of subregional decision tools 21

Conservation objectives 21

Conservation action categories 25

Future scenarios 26

Resource allocation options 27

Tradeoffs between ecosystems and outcome horizons 30

Recommended allocations and main findings 32

Lessons learned..... 34

Chapter 1. Motivation for project 35

Chapter 2. Project orientation and stakeholder engagement 38

2.1 Overview 38

2.2 Engaging stakeholders and experts..... 43

Chapter 3. Bayland wide products for subregional decision tools 48

3.1 Framing subregional decisions 48

3.2 Identifying and defining conservation objectives (fundamental objectives) 52

3.3 Identifying & refining action categories 57

3.4 Developing future scenarios and resource allocation options..... 58

3.4.1 Scenario development 58

3.4.2 Resource allocation options 61

3.5 Making predictions about drivers and conservation outcomes..... 63

3.5.1	<u>Developing influence diagrams</u>	<u>63</u>
3.5.2	<u>Choosing measurable attributes and thresholds.....</u>	<u>64</u>
3.5.3	<u>Assigning probabilities to attributes</u>	<u>65</u>
3.6	Identifying & quantifying trade-offs.....	65
3.7	Identifying recommended resource allocations	68
3.7.1	<u>Subregional decision tools</u>	<u>68</u>
3.7.2	<u>Sensitivity analysis</u>	<u>69</u>
Chapter 4.	<u>Additional details on developing Bayland wide products</u>	<u>71</u>
4.1	Framing subregional decisions	71
4.1.1	<u>Initial decision framing with project leaders and core team of stakeholders.....</u>	<u>71</u>
4.1.2	<u>Revising decision frame during stakeholder-orientation webinars.....</u>	<u>73</u>
4.1.3	<u>Finalizing decision frame during stakeholder workshop.....</u>	<u>77</u>
4.2	Identifying and defining conservation objectives	79
4.2.1	<u>Initial draft conservation objectives.....</u>	<u>79</u>
4.2.2	<u>Refining conservation objectives during webinar series</u>	<u>80</u>
4.2.3	<u>Finalizing Bayland wide conservation objectives at workshop.....</u>	<u>80</u>
4.3	Identifying & refining action categories	89
4.4	Developing an approach to allocate resources	92
4.4.1	<u>Refinements during webinar series.....</u>	<u>92</u>
4.4.2	<u>Finalizing approach during workshop</u>	<u>94</u>
4.5	Making predictions about drivers and conservation outcomes.....	97
4.5.1	<u>Developing influence diagrams</u>	<u>97</u>
4.5.2	<u>Choosing and defining measurable attributes.....</u>	<u>103</u>
4.5.3	<u>Elicitation process.....</u>	<u>104</u>
4.6	Identifying & quantifying tradeoffs	106
4.7	Identifying recommended allocations	106

Chapter 5. Subregional decision tools and management recommendations	109
5.1 North Bay	110
5.1.1 <u>Engaging stakeholders and experts.....</u>	110
5.1.2 <u>Refining conservation objectives.....</u>	110
5.1.3 <u>Refining action categories.....</u>	112
5.1.4 <u>Developing resource allocation options.....</u>	114
5.1.5 <u>Making predictions about drivers and conservation outcomes.....</u>	120
5.1.5.1 <u>External drivers and intermediate drivers.....</u>	120
5.1.5.2 <u>Eliciting quantitative inputs for decision models.....</u>	123
5.1.6 <u>Identifying & quantifying trade-offs.....</u>	123
5.1.7 <u>Identifying recommended allocations and main findings.....</u>	127
5.1.7.1 <u>Sensitivity analysis and value of resolving uncertainty.....</u>	131
5.2 Suisun.....	132
5.2.1 <u>Engaging stakeholders and experts.....</u>	132
5.2.2 <u>Refining conservation objectives.....</u>	132
5.2.3 <u>Refining action categories.....</u>	134
5.2.4 <u>Developing resource allocation options.....</u>	138
5.2.5 <u>Making predictions about drivers and conservation outcomes.....</u>	143
5.2.5.1 <u>External drivers and intermediate drivers.....</u>	143
5.2.5.2 <u>Eliciting quantitative inputs for decision tools.....</u>	146
5.2.6 <u>Identifying & quantifying trade-offs.....</u>	146
5.2.7 <u>Identifying recommended allocations and main findings.....</u>	147
5.2.7.1 <u>Sensitivity analysis and value of resolving uncertainty.....</u>	150
5.3 Central Bay.....	151
5.3.1 <u>Engaging stakeholders and experts.....</u>	151
5.3.2 <u>Refining conservation objectives.....</u>	152

5.3.3	<u>Refining action categories.....</u>	<u>154</u>
5.3.4	<u>Developing resource allocation options.....</u>	<u>158</u>
5.3.5	<u>Making predictions about drivers and conservation outcomes.....</u>	<u>162</u>
5.3.5.1	<u><i>External drivers and intermediate drivers.....</i></u>	<u>162</u>
5.3.5.2	<u><i>Eliciting quantitative inputs for decision tools.....</i></u>	<u>165</u>
5.3.6	<u>Identifying & quantifying trade-offs.....</u>	<u>165</u>
5.3.7	<u>Identifying recommended allocations and main findings.....</u>	<u>167</u>
5.3.7.1	<u><i>Sensitivity analysis and value of resolving uncertainty.....</i></u>	<u>170</u>
5.4	<u>South Bay.....</u>	<u>171</u>
5.4.1	<u>Engaging stakeholders and experts.....</u>	<u>171</u>
5.4.2	<u>Refining conservation objectives.....</u>	<u>171</u>
5.4.3	<u>Refining action categories.....</u>	<u>172</u>
5.4.4	<u>Developing resource allocation options.....</u>	<u>175</u>
5.4.5	<u>Making predictions about drivers and conservation outcomes.....</u>	<u>182</u>
5.4.5.1	<u><i>External drivers and intermediate drivers.....</i></u>	<u>182</u>
5.4.5.2	<u><i>Eliciting quantitative inputs for decision tools.....</i></u>	<u>185</u>
5.4.6	<u>Identifying & quantifying trade-offs.....</u>	<u>185</u>
5.4.7	<u>Identifying recommended allocations and main findings.....</u>	<u>189</u>
5.4.7.1	<u><i>Sensitivity analysis and value of resolving uncertainty.....</i></u>	<u>192</u>
Chapter 6.	<u>Comparison of subregional decision tools and recommendations.....</u>	<u>195</u>
6.1	<u>Refining conservation objectives.....</u>	<u>195</u>
6.2	<u>Refining action categories.....</u>	<u>201</u>
6.3	<u>Developing resource allocation options.....</u>	<u>201</u>
6.4	<u>Making predictions about drivers and conservation outcomes.....</u>	<u>205</u>
6.4.1	<u>External drivers.....</u>	<u>205</u>
6.4.2	<u>Intermediate drivers.....</u>	<u>206</u>

6.5	Identifying & quantifying trade-offs.....	206
6.6	Identifying recommended allocations and main findings	209
<u>Chapter 7. Lessons learned from CADs process</u>		214
7.1	Refining decision frame and project design	215
7.2	Engaging stakeholders and experts.....	216
7.3	Identifying and defining conservation objectives	217
7.4	Identifying & refining action categories	218
7.5	Developing resource allocation options	219
7.6	Making predictions about drivers and conservation outcomes.....	220
7.6.1	<u>Developing influence diagrams</u>	<u>220</u>
7.6.2	<u>Choosing measurable attributes and thresholds.....</u>	<u>220</u>
7.6.3	<u>Assigning probabilities to attributes</u>	<u>221</u>
7.7	Identifying & quantifying trade-offs.....	222
7.8	Identifying recommended allocations and main findings	223
7.9	Next steps and suggestions for adapting subregional CADs tools	223
7.10	Revisiting challenges and goals.....	224
7.10.1	<u>Challenges addressed.....</u>	<u>224</u>
7.10.2	<u>Goals achieved.....</u>	<u>226</u>
7.10.3	<u>Decision-analytic tool.....</u>	<u>227</u>
7.10.4	<u>Sensitivity analysis</u>	<u>228</u>
<u>Literature cited.....</u>		228
<u>Glossary of terms and abbreviations.....</u>		230

TABLE OF APPENDICES

<u>Appendix A</u>	<u>Upland transition zone projections.....</u>	<u>A-235</u>
<u>Appendix B</u>	<u>Timeline for CADS Phase 1.....</u>	<u>B-239</u>
<u>Appendix C</u>	<u>Information packet outline for stakeholder workshop.....</u>	<u>C-241</u>
<u>Appendix D</u>	<u>Breakout guide used during stakeholder workshop.</u>	<u>D-242</u>
D-1	Developing influence diagrams and measurable attributes.....	D-242
D-2	Developing future scenarios and allocation options	D-244
D-3	Identifying quantitative thresholds and relationships.....	D-246
D-4	Quantifying predictions and tradeoffs.....	D-247
<u>Appendix E</u>	<u>Influence diagrams.....</u>	<u>E-249</u>
E-1	North Bay	E-249
<u>E-1.1</u>	<u>Subtidal and intertidal mudflats, near-term</u>	<u>E-249</u>
<u>E-1.2</u>	<u>Tidal marsh, near-term.....</u>	<u>E-250</u>
<u>E-1.3</u>	<u>Managed wetland, near-term</u>	<u>E-251</u>
<u>E-1.4</u>	<u>Upland transition zone, near-term.....</u>	<u>E-252</u>
<u>E-1.5</u>	<u>Subtidal and intertidal mudflats, long-term</u>	<u>E-253</u>
<u>E-1.6</u>	<u>Tidal marsh, long-term</u>	<u>E-254</u>
<u>E-1.7</u>	<u>Managed wetlands, long-term.....</u>	<u>E-255</u>
<u>E-1.8</u>	<u>Upland transition zone, long-term</u>	<u>E-256</u>
E-2	Suisun.....	E-257
<u>E-2.1</u>	<u>Subtidal and intertidal mudflats, near-term</u>	<u>E-257</u>
<u>E-2.2</u>	<u>Tidal marsh, near-term.....</u>	<u>E-258</u>
<u>E-2.3</u>	<u>Managed wetland, near-term</u>	<u>E-259</u>
<u>E-2.4</u>	<u>Upland transition zone, near-term.....</u>	<u>E-260</u>
E-3	Central Bay.....	E-261
<u>E-3.1</u>	<u>Subtidal and intertidal mudflats, near-term</u>	<u>E-261</u>
<u>E-3.2</u>	<u>Tidal marsh, near-term.....</u>	<u>E-262</u>

E-3.3	<u>Upland transition zone, near-term.....</u>	<u>E-263</u>
E-4	<u>South Bay.....</u>	<u>E-264</u>
E-4.1	<u>Subtidal and intertidal mudflats, near-term</u>	<u>E-264</u>
E-4.2	<u>Tidal marsh, near-term.....</u>	<u>E-265</u>
E-4.3	<u>Managed ponds, near-term</u>	<u>E-266</u>
E-4.4	<u>Upland transition zone, near-term.....</u>	<u>E-267</u>
E-4.5	<u>Subtidal and intertidal mudflats, long-term</u>	<u>E-268</u>
E-4.6	<u>Tidal marsh, long-term</u>	<u>E-269</u>
E-4.7	<u>Managed ponds, long-term</u>	<u>E-270</u>
E-4.8	<u>Upland transition zone, long-term</u>	<u>E-271</u>
Appendix F	<u>Descriptions of intermediate drivers for North Bay</u>	<u>F-272</u>
Appendix G	<u>Post-workshop elicitation guide</u>	<u>G-274</u>
G-1	<u>Overview</u>	<u>G-274</u>
G-2	<u>Utilities</u>	<u>G-274</u>
G-3	<u>Probabilities</u>	<u>G-275</u>
Appendix H	<u>Additional lessons learned from decision framing</u>	<u>H-277</u>
H-1.1	<u>Project start through webinar series.....</u>	<u>H-277</u>
H-1.2	<u>Stakeholder workshop.....</u>	<u>H-278</u>
Appendix I	<u>List of files available for download</u>	<u>I-282</u>

TABLE OF TABLES

Table 2.1.1. Steps for developing Bayland wide products.....	41
Table 2.1.2. Definitions of frequently used technical terms in this report.....	42
Table 2.2.1. Core and leadership teams.	45
Table 2.2.2. Stakeholders who participated in CADS Phase 1.....	46
Table 2.2.3. Subregional teams.....	47
Table 3.1.1. Evolution to a final description of decisions (decision frame).	49
Table 3.1.2. Classification of Bayland ecosystems.....	51
Table 3.2.1. Bayland wide focal species by taxon.....	53
Table 3.2.2. Bayland wide indicators of biotic integrity.....	54
Table 3.2.3. Ecosystem-level conservation plans for Baylands.....	56
Table 3.3.1. Bayland wide action categories.	57
Table 3.4.1. Future scenarios for environmental conditions.....	59
Table 3.4.2. Future scenarios for resource availability.....	60
Table 3.4.3. Final template for developing resource allocation options.....	62
Table 3.6.1. Example table for eliciting ecosystem tradeoffs.....	67
Table 3.6.2. Example table for eliciting temporal tradeoffs.....	67
Table 4.1.1. Recommendations for decision framing from core team webinar.....	72
Table 4.1.2. Stakeholder suggestions adopted for decision framing.....	73
Table 4.1.3. Questions from stakeholders on decision framing.....	74
Table 4.1.4. Evolution toward a final decision question.....	75
Table 4.1.5. Stakeholder comments and suggestions on decision framing.....	78
Table 4.2.1. Objectives in conservation plans for the Baylands.....	81
Table 4.2.2. Stakeholder suggestions on choosing attributes for conservation objectives.....	83
Table 4.2.3. Questions from stakeholders about conservation objectives and attributes.....	84
Table 4.2.4. Hierarchy of Bayland wide conservation objectives.....	85
Table 4.3.1. Suggestions and questions from stakeholders about action categories.....	90
Table 4.3.2. Bayland wide action categories.....	91
Table 4.4.1. Suggestions and questions from stakeholders about method for allocation.....	93
Table 4.4.2. Partial template for allocating resources.....	94
Table 4.5.1. Suggestions and questions from stakeholders about making predictions.....	98
Table 4.5.2. Example table for eliciting probabilities.....	105
Table 4.6.1. Suggestions and questions from stakeholders about tradeoffs.....	106
Table 4.7.1. Questions and concerns from stakeholders about approach to making recommendations.....	107
Table 5.1.1. Indicators of biotic integrity for estuarine ecosystems of North Bay.....	111
Table 5.1.2. Recommended actions from BEHGU for North Bay.....	113
Table 5.1.3. Justifications for resource allocations in North Bay.....	115
Table 5.1.4. Near-term resource allocation options for North Bay.....	116
Table 5.1.5. Longer-term resource allocation options for North Bay.....	117
Table 5.1.6. External drivers for the North Bay decision tool.....	121
Table 5.1.7. Intermediate drivers by ecosystem for North Bay.....	122

Table 5.2.1. Indicators of biotic integrity for estuarine ecosystems of Suisun.....	133
Table 5.2.2. Set of action categories for Suisun.....	135
Table 5.2.3. Recommended actions from BEHGU for Suisun.....	136
Table 5.2.4. Justifications for resource allocations in Suisun.....	139
Table 5.2.5. Near-term resource allocation options for Suisun.....	140
Table 5.2.6. Longer-term resource allocation options for Suisun.....	141
Table 5.2.7. External drivers for the Suisun decision tool.....	144
Table 5.2.8. Intermediate drivers for the Suisun decision tool.....	145
Table 5.2.9. Expected gains after resolving uncertainties for near-term in Suisun.....	150
Table 5.3.1. Indicators of biotic integrity for estuarine ecosystems of Central Bay.....	153
Table 5.3.2. Set of action categories for Central Bay.....	154
Table 5.3.3. Recommended actions from BEHGU for Central Bay.....	155
Table 5.3.4. Near-term resource allocation options for Central Bay.....	159
Table 5.3.5. Longer-term resource allocation options for Central Bay.....	160
Table 5.3.6. External drivers for the Central Bay decision tool.....	164
Table 5.3.7. Intermediate drivers for the Central Bay decision tool.....	164
Table 5.3.8. Expected gains after resolving uncertainties for near-term in Central Bay.....	170
Table 5.4.1. Indicators of biotic integrity for estuarine ecosystems of South Bay.....	172
Table 5.4.2. Set of action categories for South Bay.....	173
Table 5.4.3. Recommended actions from BEHGU for South Bay.....	174
Table 5.4.4. Justifications for resource allocations in South Bay.....	176
Table 5.4.5. Near-term resource allocation options for South Bay.....	178
Table 5.4.6. Longer-term resource allocation options for South Bay.....	179
Table 5.4.7. External drivers for the South Bay decision tool.....	183
Table 5.4.8. Intermediate drivers for the South Bay decision tool.....	184
Table 5.4.9. Expected gains after resolving uncertainties for near-term in South Bay.....	194
Table 5.4.10. Expected gains after resolving uncertainties for long-term in South Bay.....	194
Table 6.1.1. Classifications of Bayland ecosystems for the subregional decision tools.....	195
Table 6.1.2. Indicators of biotic integrity by ecosystem and subregion.....	197
Table 6.1.3. Proposed indicators that scale up to SF Bay Estuary.....	200
Table 6.3.1. Dominant allocation percentages by action category, subregion, and time horizon.....	202
Table 6.3.2. Dominant allocation percentages by ecosystem, subregion, and time horizon.....	203
Table 6.4.1. External environmental drivers by subregion.....	205
Table 6.6.1. Recommendations for further research on management effectiveness.....	212

TABLE OF FIGURES

Figure 3.1.1. Final conceptual model describing decisions.	50
Figure 3.2.1. Final objectives hierarchy.....	55
Figure 3.5.1. Generic example influence diagram for a particular ecosystem.....	64
Figure 3.7.1. Example graph showing a pessimistic probability.	70
Figure 3.7.2. Example probabilities representing positive effect of the assume-not-so-great allocation.	70
Figure 4.1.1. Evolution toward final conceptual model describing decisions.	76
Figure 4.2.1. Initial objectives hierarchy.	86
Figure 4.2.2. Evolution of conservation objectives hierarchy with stakeholder input.....	87
Figure 4.4.1. Translating subregional allocation to segment-level actions.....	95
Figure 4.4.2. Illustration of allocating resources by segment and ecosystem.....	96
Figure 4.5.1. Bayland wide influence diagrams by estuarine ecosystem.....	99
Figure 4.5.2. Example venn diagrams showing indicators of change in biotic integrity.....	103
Figure 4.7.1. Hypothetical approach for making subregional management recommendations.....	108
Figure 5.1.1. Near-term allocation options for North Bay.....	118
Figure 5.1.2. Longer-term allocation options for North Bay.....	119
Figure 5.1.3. Stakeholder trade-offs among ecosystems in North Bay.....	124
Figure 5.1.4. Stakeholder trade-offs between outcome horizons in North Bay.....	125
Figure 5.1.5. Predicted outcomes for biotic integrity in estuarine ecosystems of North Bay.....	128
Figure 5.2.1. Near-term allocation options for Suisun.....	142
Figure 5.2.2. Stakeholder trade-offs among ecosystems and flood protection in Suisun.....	146
Figure 5.2.3. Predicted outcomes for biotic integrity in estuarine ecosystems of Suisun.....	148
Figure 5.3.1. Near-term allocation options for Central Bay.....	161
Figure 5.3.2. Stakeholder trade-offs among ecosystems and flood protection in Central Bay.....	166
Figure 5.3.3. Predicted outcomes for biotic integrity in estuarine ecosystems of Central Bay.....	168
Figure 5.4.1. Near-term allocation options for South Bay.....	180
Figure 5.4.2. Longer-term allocation options for South Bay.....	181
Figure 5.4.3. Stakeholder trade-offs among ecosystems in South Bay.....	186
Figure 5.4.4. Stakeholder trade-offs between outcome horizons in South Bay.....	187
Figure 5.4.5. Predicted outcomes for biotic integrity in estuarine ecosystems of South Bay.....	190
Figure 6.3.1. Subregional allocation options by ecosystem for the near-term.....	204
Figure 6.3.2. Subregional allocation options by action category for tidal marsh.....	204
Figure 6.5.1. Relative importance of estuarine ecosystems by subregion in the near-term.....	207
Figure 6.5.2. Tradeoffs between outcome horizons by ecosystem in North Bay and South Bay.....	208

Preface

This report provides recommended resource allocations for conserving four subregions of San Francisco (SF) Bay, including North Bay, Suisun, Central Bay and South Bay. These recommendations are based on quantitative, subregional decision tools that were developed in collaboration with stakeholders working in each subregion. The authors of this report would like to thank all the participants, including the leadership team and other stakeholders that included natural resource managers and planners working in SF Bay. Without this dedicated set of individuals, this project would not have been possible and the products of the project are intended for the stakeholders of SF Bay.

The scope of recommended resource allocations are within the Baylands that surround and include the SF Bay Estuary. The project defines four estuarine ecosystems from low to higher elevation: subtidal and intertidal mudflats, tidal marsh, managed wetlands, and upland transition zone. We also define two upland ecosystems within the Baylands where actions can be taken for conserving the Estuary: migration space (adjacent uplands) and watersheds feeding the Estuary.

The report is primarily written for stakeholders and scientists working toward conservation of the SF Bay Estuary. It may also be informative for those working on multi-scale conservation efforts in other geographic regions, or for those who are interested in broad-extent conservation planning and decision analysis.

How to use this report

The ‘Detailed Summary’ is the main entry point for almost every reader of this report. It provides a digest of the motivation for the project, Bayland-wide framework, and products for informing conservation of the SF Bay Estuary.

The body of the report is broken into 7 chapters:

- Chapter 1: Impetus and motivation for the CADS project.
- Chapter 2: Overview of the project along with a summary of the stakeholder engagement.
- Chapter 3: Description of bayland-wide products. These products informed development of subregional decision tools. This chapter is most relevant for those who want a better understanding of the basis from which the subregion-specific products were developed.
- Chapter 4: Further details on how Bayland-wide products were developed, with particular emphasis on stakeholder involvement.
- Chapter 5: Description of subregional decision tools and is targeted more toward on-ground decision makers and stakeholders working in a particular subregion.
- Chapter 6: Synthesis of findings from each of the four subregional decision tools and ideas for extending the CADS approach to include tradeoffs between subregional-level and regional-level objectives.
- Chapter 7: Looks back at what we learned through CADS Phase 1 and provides thoughts on how future conservation planning processes can be more successful within and beyond SF Bay.