

**CHAIR** Charlie Stek Maryland

December 10, 2014

VICE CHAIR **Bob Wayland** Virginia

Principals' Staff Committee Chesapeake Bay Program

Paul Bruder Pennsylvania

Via Email

John Dawes Pennsylvania

Andrew Der Maryland

Dear PSC.

Matthew Ehrhart Pennsylvania

Greg Evans Virginia

Christy Everett Virginia

Dale Gardner Virginia

Verna Harrison Maryland

Jeff Holland Maryland

Paula Jasinski Virginia

Patricia Levin Pennsylvania

Joseph Maroon Virginia

William D. Martin, Jr. Washington, DC

Karen McJunkin Washington, DC

Jennifer Reed-Harry Pennsylvania

Erica Rosenberg Washington, DC

Nikki Tinsley Maryland

Victor Ukpolo Maryland

Neil Wilkie Maryland

As your citizen advisors, the Citizens Advisory Committee wishes to share with you two issues of Bay Program partnership governance that we believe are critical to the continued success of the Program. These are timely issues that are currently under discussion by the Partnering and Leadership Goal Implementation Team (GIT 6) as its members work to finalize a draft Bay Program Governance Document (Governance Document.) Governance Document will guide process and operational procedures for the partnership as the watershed community works toward meeting the goals and outcomes of the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement. The following recommendations are a result of CAC's discussion at our quarterly meeting on November 20-21, 2014 about the continued work of the Program on BMP verification and a concern about the potential to allow double credit in the Bay Model for Nutrient Management Plans.

## Issue 1: Reach a higher threshold for the circumstances requiring super-majority voting

We recommend the Governance Document redefine the circumstances under which a "super-majority" vote takes place at all levels of the Bay Program including the workgroups under the Goal Implementation Teams. We believe that if a workgroup or GIT is unable to reach consensus (the traditional operating procedure for the Bay Program, which CAC fully supports) then you as the PSC should be notified and asked to help resolve the decision through a consensus process. As the draft Governance Document states in the CBP vision and principles, "The Partnership will...seek consensus when making decisions". We do not support the use of super-majority votes unless as a last resort and only after the leadership of the Bay Program has had the opportunity to help build consensus around the topic.

## Issue 2: Provide for Advisory Committee involvement in the Management Board

Traditionally, any Advisory Committees that wished to have a formal voice on the Management Board were included. The current draft of the Governance Document





states that only the signatories of the Watershed Agreement are eligible to be a part of the decision making on the MB, PSC and EC. The CAC, LGAC and STAC volunteers have endeavored to participate in as many of these meetings as possible. We would like to see the Advisory Committees' participation in MB decision making reinstated in the final Governance Document. This would allow for the Advisory Committees that wish to have a formal voice to participate in this way. CAC believes it is important for the Bay Program to allow for the inclusion of a citizen voice on topics addressed by the Management Board.

Thank you for your consideration. The Citizens Advisory Committee looks forward to your responses. Please feel free to contact me if you would like to discuss this further.

Charlie Stek Chair, Citizens Advisory Committee

cc: Management Board



