



Chesapeake Bay Program
Science. Restoration. Partnership.

Principals' Staff Committee Meeting
April 7, 2026

Governance and Structure

Three Things Up Front

- 1. We are halfway through the Governance and Structure revision process – great progress has been made in 3 months.** A clean and redlined draft was shared to the PSC on March 24th. The Management Board will seek consensus on the final revised Governance and Management Framework on June 11th before it proceeds for PSC Approval on June 30th.
- 2. The Implementation Team is working through several areas that have required focused discussion at the Management Board.** These areas are moving towards resolution, but will be reviewed today for awareness.
- 3. The Implementation Team is seeking discussion and guidance today from the PSC on a prioritization process,** particularly an overarching mechanics, criteria, benefits or enhanced support, and utilization of advisory committees.

Approaching resolution with Management Board...

1. **Workgroup Decision-Making** [Section V(D)(3)(c-d), p. 19]
2. **Program Support** [Section V(F); p. 21-23]
3. **Accountability and Adaptive Management** [Section VII]



[CLEAN DRAFT \[LINK\]](#)



[REDLINE DRAFT](#)

Workgroup Decision-Making [Section V(D)(3)(c-d)]

- Cumulative set of initial revisions have raised discussion on decision-making authority and flow between Goal Teams and Workgroups.
- Balancing between potentially duplicate affirmation processes and ensuring consequential decisions by a Workgroup are appropriately weighed by Goal Teams.
- **Seeking to outline the level of decision-making that Workgroups can make unilaterally without elevating for Goal Team approval.** Language will be updated in preparation for April 16th. Management Board; reference Section V(D)(3)(c-d), p. 20.

Chesapeake Bay Program Support [Section V(F)]

- Initial revisions significantly streamlined governance text for alignment to S. 117 support functions and to enable flexibility with how support can be organized.
- Implementation Team and Management Board requested explicit structure aligned to the EC Charge, clearer responsibilities, and operational details.
- **Three program support bodies will exist.** One body will support CBP leadership and focus on: “**planning and operational effectiveness**”. Two bodies will support CBP implementation groups and focus on: “**science and analytical support**”, and “**outreach and engagement**”. Details are being refined; reference Section V(F)(2-3), p.22-23.

Accountability & Adaptive Management [Section VII]

- Revisions have sought to consistently define a CBP adaptive management framework and how CBP aligns that framework with its accountability mechanisms for CBWA implementation (i.e., Management Strategies, and Workplans).
- Overall, more detail and clarification was requested for articulating roles and responsibilities for the PSC, Goal Teams, and Workgroups, particularly related to accountability.
- **Additional comments are being solicited for fine-tuning and/or expanding details in preparation for the April 16th Management Board meeting.**

For PSC discussion and guidance...

1. Prioritization Process

- a) Overarching Mechanics
- b) Establishing a Priority
- c) Resource Considerations
- d) Utilizing Advisory Committees

Prioritization Process – Overarching Mechanics

- The Implementation Team wishes to articulate details and mechanics outside of the Governance and Management Framework. An example prioritization process has been shared – [click here](#).



- **PSC generally supports a bilateral prioritization process that includes the Goal Teams vetting priorities moving up to the PSC.**

Such a process would also include:

- PSC setting priorities for Goal Teams / Workgroups focus as they arise.
- Guiding criteria for aligning priority development, discussion, and approval.

Prioritization Process – Establishing a “Priority”

Seeking PSC input on criteria to develop, which could include:

- *Impact on Watershed Agreement outcome*: The initiative will have a direct impact on the results of an outcome or target from the revised Watershed Agreement
- *Time-sensitive or emergent in nature*: The priority initiative represents a significant barrier to Outcome attainment for multiple jurisdictions and requires focused collaborative effort.
- *Directed collaboration*: Initiative requires enhanced collaboration amongst technical and implementation bodies and/or explicit agency from program leadership to take on the work.
- *Beyond annual deliverables*: Unique from existing deliverables.

Prioritization Process – Resource Considerations

Once the PSC approves a priority—what does that mean for the approved priority?

- Does the PSC then advocate for funding from their respective funding authorities?
- Is there a PSC champion for the priority? Greater accountability, leadership attention and direction . . . ?

Prioritization Process – Utilizing Advisory Committees

- **How does the PSC want to integrate the Advisory Committees on priority-setting?** Guidance could include:
 - ACs **providing direct priority requests to the PSC**, such as for cross-Goal priorities.
 - ACs **working through Goal Teams** on their priority requests, at least for scoping purposes.