

## Management Board Conference Call

April 9, 2015

### Actions and Decisions

#### Management Strategy Public Input Review

**Action:** Agreed that Goal Team Chairs should flag for the Management Board (MB) any high level issues that are controversial or which need a Management Board decision during their May 28 meeting.

Goal Teams have considered and resolved issues raised through public comments. The Management Board will be requested to assist in the resolution of issues if any Goal Teams could not come to resolution themselves. (As of 5-18-15 no issues are expected for Management Board resolution.)

**Decision/Action:** Agreed that an Issues Resolution Committee (IRC) will not be convened as long as the Management Board is able to act as the decision-making group. In the event an IRC is needed, each MB signatory representative is asked to identify their IRC representative by April 27.

**Decision:** Agreed that any changes to management strategies resulting from public input should be approved by the Management Board.

Revised management strategies, based on public input received, were submitted to the Chesapeake Bay Program Office on May 22, 2015 in clean and “track changes” versions, and shared with the Management Board for approval.

**Action:** Agreed that both a clean version and a “track changes” version of any *revised* management strategy should be provided to the MB for their May meeting. Comments requiring a Management Board decision should be highlighted in the public input comment registry to eliminate the need to develop additional documents for Partnership review.

Revised management strategies, based on public input received, were submitted to the Chesapeake Bay Program Office on May 22, 2015 in clean and “track changes” versions, and shared with the Management Board for approval.

Bulleted lists of issues raised through public comments that need Management Board resolution will be submitted, as well as a high level summary of major themes or issues.

**Decision:** Agreed that CBP staff should develop a high-level summary document that explains how the Chesapeake Bay Program addressed major themes of public comments. (This summary will be similar to the summary response document released with the final 2014 Watershed Agreement).

To be developed.

#### Biennial Workplan Template

**Action:** Agreed that CBP staff will convene a small team of Management Board members and Goal Team Chairs to explore the workplan development timeline and issues related to the funding column in the Biennial Workplan template.

A Biennial Workplan development timeline has been recommended by Principals' Staff Committee Chair, Secretary Molly Ward.

#### Program Response to Advisory Committees

**Decision:** The Management Board will be expected to respond to the Advisory Committee's recommendations, in writing, within 90 days of receiving a report. The 90 day response period may be extended by an additional 30 days on a case-by-case basis at the specific request of the Management Board Chair. Language consistent with this policy will be added to the PSC and Executive Council sections of the Governance Document.

Recommended language integrated into Governance Document revisions.

#### Governance Document Revisions

#	Issue	Location	Management Board Approved Resolution
1	Add specifics on general decision making within the program in order to address consensus-based decision making.	p. 4, "CBP Vision and Principles"	<p><b>For Better Defining Decision-Making Processes (p. 4):</b></p> <p><b>Decision</b> (Option 1): Hotlink "consensus" throughout the document to the decision-making process section on p. 18.</p>
2	What is the process for selecting the EC Chair outside of the annual meeting?	p. 6, "EC Leadership and Membership"	<p>P. 6 states, "Leadership of the EC is rotated among the full members on a mutually agreed basis determined at each annual meeting;" however, there is a need to formalize this process outside of the annual meeting.</p> <p><b>For a Formal Process for Selecting the EC Chair Outside of the Annual Meeting (p. 6):</b></p> <p><b>Decision</b> (Option 1): PSC members will act as a proxy for their EC member by soliciting their input, and a decision will be made at the next PSC meeting. The decision will be memorialized in writing and signed by signatory representatives on the PSC <i>[on behalf of the Executive Council]</i>.</p>
3	Need to make provisions for when EC business must be conducted between annual meetings.	p. 7, "EC Operations, Business Between Annual Meetings"	<p><b>Decision:</b> A provision was added to the "EC Operations" section on p. 7: "In the event that business must be conducted between annual EC meetings, each members' principals' staff will act on their behalf at the PSC level. If a meeting of the EC is required, a special meeting may be called by the Chair or by a majority of the members of the EC. The purpose of the meeting will be stated in the call for the meeting and will be scheduled in consultation with all EC members.</p>

			Public notice of all meetings will be made as soon as possible after logistics are confirmed.”
4	PSC meeting planning must be clearly defined.	p. 9, “PSC Operations, Protocol for Planning Meetings”	<p><b>Decision:</b> A provision has been added to “PSC Operations” on p. 9: <i>“Protocol for planning PSC meetings:</i> PSC meeting dates are determined through a poll of the PSC members. All members are polled, including non-voting members (i.e., Advisory Committee Chairs). Key staff and administrative assistants are included on the poll; interested parties are not included. The PSC strives for transparency with all correspondence; however, it is necessary for meeting date polls to include only PSC members and key staff. A meeting date is established based on broadest member representation and communicated to PSC members and interested parties via email. Meeting agenda and location are established as soon as possible, and no less than a week before the meeting. All meeting information is posted on the Partnership’s web calendar.”</p> <p><b>[Add wording from Virginia – PSC Chair makes final decision on meeting date.]</b></p>
5	Reinstate Advisory Committees’ participation in MB decision-making. <i>(from CAC letter to PSC on Dec. 10, 2014)</i>	p. 10, “MB Leadership and Membership”; p. 11, “MB Decision-Making”	<p>Advisory Committees and GIT Chairs will remain non-voting members of MB. The governance document currently states that, “non-voting members do not have a vote in supermajority votes; however, they do have a voice in discussions, a seat at the table, and the right to receive all communication and materials” (p.10).</p> <p><b>For Advisory Committee Participation in MB Decision-Making (p.11):</b></p> <p><b>Decision (Option 1):</b> Change existing language to: “All members have a voice in discussions contributing to the development of consensus, a seat at the table, and the right to receive all communication and materials. In the event that consensus cannot be reached, the issue will be decided by supermajority vote of signatory members. <b>[Supporting and dissenting votes of the signatory representative and views of the advisory committees will be recorded.]”</b></p>
6	Add details on 2 year check in with GIT Chairs.	p. 13, “GIT Leadership and Membership”	<p><b>For Formalizing the 2 Year Check-in with GIT Chairs (p.13):</b></p> <p><b>Decision (Option 1):</b> The GIT collectively discusses the renewal or change of their Chairmanship and Vice-Chairmanship every two years. The renewal of a Chair will have concurrence from both the GIT and the MB. Otherwise, the Vice-Chair assumes the role of Chair with concurrence from the GIT and MB, and the new Vice-Chair will be selected by GIT members. In the event that the Vice-Chair is</p>

			<p>not interested in assuming the role of Chair, the GIT will nominate a new Chair and gain concurrence from the MB.</p> <p><b>(The date is not critical.)</b></p>
7	<p>Refine the circumstances under which supermajority votes take place. If a group cannot reach consensus, the PSC should resolve the decision through consensus. Super majority votes should only be used by the leadership of the Bay Program as a last resort. <i>(from CAC letter to PSC on Dec. 10, 2014)</i></p>	<p>pp. 7, 8, 11, 14, “Decision-Making”</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> A small group will explore Issue 7 of the Governance Document recommended revisions regarding workgroups polling members (rather than holding a supermajority or other type of vote) and elevating issues that they couldn’t reach consensus on to the Management Board. Volunteers include: Diane Davis, Carin Bisland, Jessica Blackburn, James Davis-Martin, and Jenn Volk. Supermajority votes remain a function of the EC, PSC, and MB. GIT 6 has developed options for determining if GITs should have the ability to exercise a supermajority vote.</p> <p><b>Signatory preferences:</b>  Option 1: MD, CBC  Option 3: VA  Option 3, add polling: D.C.</p> <p><b>Options for GIT/WG Supermajority Voting (p. 14):</b>  <b>Option 1:</b> No supermajority votes will take place below the MB level. If consensus cannot be reached through the consensus process outlined on p. 18 at the GIT or workgroup level, the issue will be elevated to the next highest decision-making body for a decision (i.e., issues at the workgroup level will be raised to the GIT level, issues at the GIT level will be raised to the MB).  <b>Option 2:</b> No action. Stay with the original language of supermajority vote.  <b>Option 3:</b> Develop consistent language that is used for EC, PSC, MB, and GITs. At the GIT/WG level, the GIT/WG will seek consensus, if consensus cannot be reached, the group is able to utilize a supermajority vote, and except for administrative issues the decision is elevated to the MB for ratification.  <b>Option 4:</b> If consensus cannot be reached, the issue will be elevated directly to the PSC.</p> <p><b>GIT 6 recommends Option 3.</b></p>