

Governance Document Issues for Management Board Review

The following Issues were not resolved by GIT 6. GIT 6 requests that MB review.

Issue	Question	Section
Program evaluation	Should the governance document explicitly describe an annual performance review meeting during which a range of metrics and other information are used to review management strategy progress and decide on needed adjustments to planned work and resource allocations? Watershed Agreement elements addressed by such a planned review would include performance transparency and outcome and management strategy review (with every other year being a mid-point in the two-year cycle committed to in the Watershed Agreement).	Multiple
Chair of the Management Board	Currently the governance document identifies that the Management Board would be chaired by the Director of the CBPO. Should the Management Board Chair always be the Chesapeake Bay Program Office Director?	Leadership and Membership of the MB Page 8
Federal Decision Making at the MB	Do we need to create an addendum or to add additional language that would clarify how the Federal members would act as a delegation if a vote is required - e.g. what is the process for Federal Agency input to EPA and how is a final voting position decided?	MB Operations Page 9
GIT Chairs	Does this document need to spell out the criteria for determining if a Chair can serve consecutive terms?	GIT Leadership & Membership Page 11
	Will the Vice Chair automatically become Chair at the end of the term?	GIT Leadership & Membership Page 11
GIT Governance	How much flexibility is needed for each GIT to have separate governance procedures as they relate to other decisions besides Management Strategies, e.g. should there be a consistent set of guidelines for all GIT decision making?	GIT Leadership & Membership Page 11
	As several GITs have already established their own charters to govern their operations should that be acknowledged within this Governance document?	GIT Leadership & Membership Page 11
Criteria for Changing Goals and Outcomes	See below framework as developed by the CBC	Goals, Outcomes and Management Strategies Page 19

####

Criteria for EC and PSC to determine whether to change a Goal or Outcome in the Bay Agreement

The Bay Agreement states:

“As the signatories identify new opportunities and concerns, Goals or Outcomes may be adopted or modified. Any changes or additions to Goals will be approved by the Executive Council. The Principals’ Staff Committee will approve changes or additions to Outcomes, although significant changes or additions will be raised to the Executive Council for approval. Proposed changes to Goals and Outcomes or the addition of new ones will be open for public input before being finalized.”

- 1. Goals or Outcomes may be adopted or modified if the signatories identify new opportunities and concerns.**
 - a. Changes to GOALS**
 - i. The Executive Council will approve any changes or additions to Goals.
 - ii. Changes to Goals should not be made for political or economic reasons and the rationale for the change should have a substantial basis in facts and science.
 - b. Changes to OUTCOMES**
 - i. The Principals’ Staff Committee will approve “non-significant” changes or additions to Outcomes.
 - ii. Changes to Outcome should not be made for political or economic reasons and the rationale for the change should have a substantial basis in facts and science.
 - iii. The following list is illustrative of circumstances that would warrant an Outcome change by the PSC. The list is not meant to restrict the PSC to these scenarios because every circumstance that could possibly arise cannot be anticipated at this time.
 - mistake in fact
 - new scientific discoveries or evidence warrants a slightly-revised target or outcome number.
 - New science or management approaches that warrant a language change to more accurately reflect actions necessary
 - c. “Significant” changes or additions to Outcomes will be raised to the Executive Council for approval.**
 - i. Significant changes include:
 1. Any change that decreases numeric targets
 2. Changes that call for a 10% or more increase in numeric targets.
 3. Any new outcomes that are not currently in the Agreement

4. Any change that the PSC considers to be significant enough to warrant EC consideration