Proposed Governance Document text describing process for revising Watershed Agreement Goals and Outcomes (July 5, 2018 version)

Goal Revision Text (to be inserted on pg 19 of Governance Document Version 3.0 following current "**Goals**" bullet.

> Process: The lead GIT or Management Board (with lead GIT input) may propose "retirement" (for existing Goals that have passed their due date without completion but for which no further effort is recommended), "completion" (for existing Goals that have been met), "modification" of existing Goals, or creation of "new" Goals to the Management Board.   Accompanying the recommendation should be a brief, written description providing justification and background, data to support the recommendation, proposed wording, partner and resource implications, and (in the case of "modified" or "new" Goals) proposed baseline measures and lead Workgroup. Upon consideration and discussion of the recommendation, the Management Board may choose to a) reject the recommendation, b) refer the recommendation back to the lead GIT for further revision and possible resubmission, or c) accept the recommendation and forward the recommended action and accompanying written description (with or without Management Board modifications) to the PSC for consideration.   The PSC, in turn, may choose to a) reject, b) refer back to the Management Board for further revision, or c) accept and forward the recommendation and written description (with or without PSC modifications) to the EC. If the PSC chooses to forward the recommendation to the EC for consideration, the PSC proposed language must first be submitted for a 30 day public comment, and those comments reviewed and considered prior to submission to the EC. In most cases, the PSC may choose to charge the lead GIT with compiling the public comments and recommending modifications (if any) back to the PSC via the Management Board. There is nothing to preclude the lead GIT or Management Board from also seeking public comment in the earlier stages of this process, but the PSC must submit their final recommended language for public comment at least once before forwarding to the EC. If language modifications based on that public comment are deemed significant enough by the PSC, the PSC may then choose to submit that modified language for subsequent 30 day public comment prior to forwarding to the EC. Finally, the EC may choose to a) reject, b) refer the recommendation back to the PSC for revision, or c) approve and charge the CBP with publishing the change as "final".

> Insert Goal Change Process graphic

Outcome Revision Text (to be inserted on pg 19 of Governance Document Version 3.0 following current "**Outcomes**" bullet.

> Process: The process for revision of a Watershed Agreement Outcome is identical to that described above for a Goal, with one exception.   As per the Watershed Agreement,

the PSC has the authority to approve changes to Outcomes, "although significant changes or additions will be raised to the Executive Council for approval".   Therefore, if the PSC is of consensus to accept a proposed revision to an existing Outcome or accept a new Outcome, the PSC must then decide if the revised / new Outcome is significant enough to warrant forwarding to the EC for final approval or if the PSC is comfortable approving the revised / new Outcome as final and informing the EC of their decision.

Insert Outcome Change Process graphic