



Chesapeake Bay Program
Science. Restoration. Partnership.

Management Board Meeting
April 16, 2026

Governance and Structure

Today's Approach

- 1. Overview of Progress** – Report out since March MB; Implementation Team process. [5 min]
- 2. Review Roadmap** – Set expectations for May and June timeline before discussion. Brief Q/A. [15 min]
- 3. Partner Feedback** – Open the floor for non-MB meeting participants. [20 min]
- 4. GMF Discussion** – Walkthrough specific areas in process [120 min]
- 5. Next Steps** – Recap actions and immediate timeline. [10 min]

Will have a brief break during GMF discussion and lunch between Discussion and Next Steps @ approximately 1:00p

Since March MB...

- **Pre-PSC Revision Window (03/12- 03/24)**
 - Addressed March MB comments on PSC representation, GT chair identification, program support, public participation, decision-making, and adaptive management.
- **April 7th PSC Meeting**
 - Specified MB attention on three items: Workgroup decision-making, Program Support, Accountability and Adaptive Management.
 - Discussion on priority framework: strongly support bilateral process; supportive of details held outside of GMF; prefer AC-PSC communication line on priorities; some suggestions for clarity on criteria and resource support.
- **Pre-PSC Revision Window (04/02- 04/10)**
 - Brief window; addressed existing IT comments from March MB version; identified a few new areas for revision.
 - Currently ~50 comments; some for awareness, some poised for discussion for today, some loose.

MB Roadmap

PSC
Management Board
[Sig] Implementation Team
Federal Office Directors
Federal Holiday

April '26						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30		

May '26						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30
31						

June '26						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30				

May 14th MB Meeting: Red flag Review...to ensure a productive discussion...

- A draft will be shared on May 7 to the Management Board....to do that....
- Implementation Team will meet on May 4 to affirm revisions and identify outstanding issues...to do that...
- Implementation Team will receive a draft on April 28...to ensure this version is reflective of feedback...
- [The Implementation Team will accept written feedback by April 21st](#). See Slide 6 for process.

June 11th MB Meeting: Consensus review and decisions...to ensure final revisions are delivered on 6/16 for the 6/30 PSC meeting.

- A final draft will be shared on May 28 to the Management Board (two weeks in advance)....to do that....
- Implementation Team will review final revisions on May 26...to do that...
- A final draft will be prepared on May 19, addressing red flag issues from the May MB meeting.



Open Feedback Period

1. Please share areas of support
and / or
2. Where you see a major issue

Walking through GMF

1. Content leads will provide a brief overview of each section.
2. We will use the Governance and Management Framework to walk through comments. The Implementation Team has identified specific areas for MB discussion.
3. Facilitator will move us along if we're stuck. Action will be identified to unstick.
 - Solid change, agreed and acted upon in real time.
 - Wordsmithing issue; specify action/actor for proposing a resolution.
4. We'll pause at each section and identify if there are any other STOPS (1) or HOLDS (2) by MB members. A proposed resolution should be shared by April 21st to be considered by the Implementation Team.

SLIDES 8 - 14

The following slides are intended as a “cheat sheet” or process agenda to help facilitate and focus the discussion.

On each slide..

- The content lead that is providing a brief section overview is in GREEN.
- The IT member opening up a particular question for discussion is in BLUE.



To help with time management, Stars indicate that the comment is anticipated to be a longer discussion or sticky.

Section I – III: Introduction, Vision and Principles, DEIJ [EPA Overview - Doug]

- No specific comments for MB discussion.

Section IV: Ethical Behavior Guidelines [EPA Overview - Khesha]

- No specific comments for MB discussion.

Section V: Organizational Structure [EPA Overview - Doug]

Proposed strawman of CBP Org Chart.

For discussion:

SAC request structure includes federal family.



Section V(A): EC No specific comments for MB discussion. [PA Overview]

Section V(B): Policy Steering Committee [PA Overview]

- Roles and Responsibilities (c) – p.13 [EPA - Dan]
 - **Proposal to retain only the bolded text of a submitted Responsibility:** “Promote transparency and coordination by providing input on funding priorities and planned actions in alignment with partnership priorities. The PSC acts as a forum for early communication and input on significant funding actions related to the Chesapeake Bay Program implementation, including major grant programs and Notices of Funding Opportunity (NOFOs), as practicable and consistent with applicable authorities and timelines.”
- Operations (b) - Quorum– p.15 [EPA – Amy]
 - ★ **Proposed language for clarifying Quorum, but need to determine who counts and threshold:** “Full decision-making member participation is required in a meeting to establish a quorum of the PSC. Decisions may be made between meetings by electronic communication provided that all members are given the opportunity to participate and a quorum responds...”
- Operations (d) – Setting Priorities– p.15 [Anna]
 - **Should the following statement be included:** “The Advisory Committees will leverage their networks to seek out active stakeholder and public participation in the development of priority tasks and assignments.”

Section V(C): GOAL TEAMS [Kevin Overview]

- Membership – p.18 [Kevin S.]

- ★ Seeking to clearly articulate roles and responsibilities of Advisory members. Noted a challenge for understanding “one-voice” of a jurisdiction in certain contexts. **How will Advisory members be formally determined, particularly “additional representatives”?**
- The membership table will be removed from the GMF, however, there is still a need to clearly demarcate decision-making members from advisory members. **How should documentation be carried out in practice? What is the associated language for the GMF?**

- Membership – p. 19 and Operations (b) – p.20 [Kevin S., Julia]

- ★ Comment thread on outlining “opting out” and what it means to “commit”. **Seeking MB consensus on revised statement:** “Signatories do not need to provide a representative to a GT if they determine they are not providing significant resources towards any of the outcomes or targets under that goal.”
- Additional language is sought for **describing how Signatories not participating in a Goal have awareness as decisions migrate to the PSC.**

Section V(D): Workgroups [Kevin Overview]

- Leadership and Membership – p. 21 [EPA – Doug]
 - ★ • Current language aligns Workgroup Operations with GT Operations, and presumably membership. GT membership specifies signatory members (n=9) are nominated by the PSC and at-large members (n=6) are determined following group decision-making rules. **Is this the intended specifies for how Workgroup membership is formally established?**
- Operations (c-d) – p. 21 [Kevin S. / PA]
 - ★ • Need to outline the level of decision-making that WGs can make unilaterally without elevating for GT approval. **What other specifications are needed?**
 - Several examples are given in Operations (c): “Decisions such as changes in Management Strategies and workplans; proposals for allocation of resources; membership criteria; and leadership nominations should be elevated to the appropriate GT. “

Section V(E) – Action Teams [Kevin S., but no changes]

- No specific comments for MB discussion.

Section V(F) – Federal Managers Council (FMC) [EPA – Dan]

- No specific comments for MB discussion.

Section V(G): Chesapeake Bay Program Support [EPA – Doug Overview]

- General Program Support and Coordination – p. 22 [Leila / Kevin M.]
 - **Disagreement with striking of “in partnership”.** Seeking discussion on how best to represent program support beyond the EPA-CBPO. Also seeking discussion on working “in partnership” on resources dedicated to program support.
- Implementation Support for Goal Teams and Workgroups, science support team – p. 24 [EPA - Doug]
 - Questions have been raised on how are these teams different from STAR and SET and inconsistencies between the two teams and with other group leadership/membership. **Seeking to affirm details.**
 - Science support has two assigned Co-Chairs, one CBPO, one USGS. Engagement support has one assigned Co-Chair to CBPO.
 - Membership is fundamentally different from other groups. Noted as “flexible”, albeit requiring documentation. The Outreach Co-Chair is also determined by “members”.
 - Science support required to hold six public meetings. Engagement four.
 - An additional responsibility has been added and then merged: “Provide support for other science, technical, and analytical issues that are outside the responsibility of a single GT or workgroup, but benefit the partnership at large, such as addressing and accounting for changing environmental conditions. **Is this an effective merger?**”

Section V(H): Chesapeake Bay Program Advisory Committees [PA Overview]

- Introductory paragraph and Roles and Responsibilities – p. 25 and 27 [Anna]

- ★ • There are numerous comments, but overall, Implementation Team believes this paragraph requires a close review and ensure that it holds direct language for long-term interpretation. **What is the appropriate action(s) for resolution and points of emphasis?**

Section VI(A): General Guidance for Meeting Participation [Leila Overview]

- Exceptions to Public Meetings, 2nd bullet – p. 28 [Leila]
 - Four specific, but similar, examples were consolidated into a single bullet. **Is this an acceptable synthesis?**
- Partnership Principles, 3rd paragraph – p. 28 [Leila]
 - Two comments that have yet to be incorporated. **What actions can be taken?**

Section VI(B-E): Decision Making Sections [EPA - Amy Overview]



Section C – Decision Rules – p. 30 [Amy]

- **How do we define supermajority (60%, 2/3, 75%)?** Significant implications with different group sizes.

- Section D – Voting – p. 31 [Amy]

- **Does the consent process start with all members of decision-making members?**
- How does CBP reconcile a majority voting feature at the Workgroup level if it is consequential and leads to changes to policy or programmatic implementation. **When can Workgroups utilize simple or supermajority?**

Section D – Voting – p. 31 [Amy]

- Decision making model / diagram feedback

- Section E – Modification or Reversal of Previous Consensus Decision – p. 33 [Amy]

- The implementation of this and the entity that does not consent to the change have led to confusion. **When does someone need to provide additional information or an alternate decision?**

Section VII(A): Accountability [EPA – Doug Overview]

- Introductory statement – p. 34 [Doug]
- ★ Stakeholders Advisory Committee suggests the inclusion of **how the CBP defines accountability**. **What are the considerations necessary for defining accountability? What relationship is this intended for?**

Section VII(B): Adaptive Management [EPA – Doug Overview]

- Introductory paragraph – p. 34-35 [Doug]
 - An adaptive management framework for the CBP was defined, plus an additional reference to the Department of Interior's adaptive management implementation guidance was offered for those Outcomes and/or Targets seeking to applying its described methodology. **There is concern that the reference to DOI's guidance is confusing or marks a difference in quality**. **What action should be taken?**
- Management Strategy Review – p. 35 [Doug]
 - Assuming the 6-year review is an opportunity to reflect on more items than just Management Strategy implementation, **what is the preferred term to use?**
 - Strategy Review? Management Strategy Review?
 - Program Review? Strategy and Program Review?