Principals' Staff Committee Meeting
February 28, 2014
Actions and Decisions

Decision 1: Decision-making
- *Issue 1: Decision-making at the EC, PSC, and MB should be done by signatory representatives through: (a) consensus, (b) mainly consensus, but if consensus cannot be reached, supermajority, (c) supermajority*

    Issue Decision: Decision-making at the Executive Council, Principals' Staff Committee, and Management Board will be done by signatory representatives through consensus, . If after substantial discussions consensus cannot be reached a supermajority vote will be utilized(7-2)., by supermajority vote.
- *Issue 2: Decision-making for GITs should be done by (a) all members, or (b) signatories participating in management strategies through (a) consensus, (b) mainly consensus, but if consensus cannot be reached, supermajority, (c) supermajority*

    Issue Decision: Decision-making for Goal Implementation Teams on Management Strategies will be done by members participating in Management Strategies through consensus. If after substantial negotiations consensus cannot be reached a super majority vote will be utilized, or, only as a last resort if consensus cannot be reached, by supermajority vote.

Decision 2: Goals and Outcomes in the 2014 Agreement
- *Issue 1: Who approves revised or added goals? (a) PSC, (b) EC*
    Issue Decision: The Executive Council makes the decision to approve revised or added goals.
- *Issue 2: Who approves revised or added outcomes? (a) PSC, (b) EC*
    Issue Decision: The Principals' Staff Committee approves of revised or additions to outcomes.

    Decision: Develop a predictable and transparent process to ensure that changes to any part of the Agreement are well publicized and receive public input.

Decision 3: Participation in Management Strategies
- *Issue 1: Is participation in management strategies made unilaterally by the signatories? (i.e. Does each signatory, partner, and interested stakeholder decide which Management Strategies they participate in and how they participate.)*
    Issue Decision: The decision to participate in each Management Strategy is made unilaterally by each signatory.

- *Issue 2: What is the process for engaging and including interested stakeholders in the GITs while they are developing the management strategies?*

    Issue Decision: The Communications Workgroup will develop a basic framework to assure that stakeholders who are interested in the Goal Implementation Teams' Management Strategy development remain informed throughout the process, and will offer suggestions for future outreach plans hosted by a third party, similar to what the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay had done in the past. Recommendations will be provided at the April Principals' Staff Committee meeting.

- *Issue 3: Does a signatory have to identify which management strategies they are NOT participating in?*

    Issue Decision: We will identify participating jurisdictions in each management strategy.

Decision 4: Adoption of Management Strategies

- *Issue 1: Who formally accepts Management Strategies as complete, (a) GITs, (b) MB or(c) PSC d) MB subject to PSC ratification?*

    Issue Decision: The Management Board will formally accept the Management Strategies as complete, subject to Principals' Staff Committee ratification.

Discussion 5: Revising Management Strategies

- *Issue 1: Who accepts revisions to management strategies (including addition of new strategies)? (a) GITs, (b) MB, (c) PSC, or (d) MB with PSC ratification?*

    Issue Decision: The Management Board will formally accept revisions and additions to the Management Strategies, subject to Principals' Staff Committee ratification.

- *Issue 2: How frequently should Management Strategies be revised or reviewed? (a) Every two years, (c) as determined by the GITs?*

    Issue Decision: Management Strategies should be reviewed at a minimum of once every year. [Duplicative of Decision 7]

Decision 6: Management Strategy Elements

- *Issue 1: Should there be a format/template for management strategies?*

    Issue Decision: Goal Implementation Teams will be provided with a basic format for Management Strategies, which will be flexible to allow for GIT-specific modifications as appropriate.

- *Issue 2: Does the format/template need to be agreed to prior to signing the Agreement?*

    Issue Decision: There was a general consensus that it would be beneficial for the template to be finalized prior to signing the Agreement, but the Agreement process

should not be held up if the format has not been resolved. A draft template will be presented at the April Principals' Staff Committee retreat.

Decision 7: Management Reviews
- *Issue 1: Who has the role of tracking performance of management strategies? (a) GITs, (b) MB, (c) PSC*
  Issue Decision: The Management Board will track the implementation of Management Strategies and the environmental response from these implementation efforts.
- *Issue 2: How frequently should these reviews occur?*
  Issue Decision: Management Strategy reviews to ensure that actions are being implemented and are staying on track should occur every year, or more frequently as needed (performance review). Frequency of review of the expected responses of the environment should be included in the Management Strategies and should be based on adaptive management principles associated with best information on when an environmental result is expected.

Decision 8: Distribution to EPA funding under Section 117 CBIG/CBRAP
- *Issue 1: How is the partnership involved with this decision?* (Reminder: It is EPA's legal responsibility to make decisions on Section 117 funding; EPA typically reaches out to the signatories concerning distribution of these funds.)
  Issue Decision: The Chesapeake Bay Program Office staff will explore the question of partner involvement in budget and funding issues, including the idea for an annual conference in the spring to discuss progress and funding priorities of all partners, and will provide recommendations at the April Principals' Staff Committee meeting.

Decision 9: Participation at the Executive Council Meeting
- *Issue 1: Is there an expectation or commitment by all signatories to attend EC meetings? (i.e. Who is expected to attend the EC meeting – the principals, or the principals' appointees?)*
  Issue Decision: There is an expectation and commitment by all signatories to have their principals try to attend Executive Council meetings. If not the Principal, then the highest possible appointee should attend in his or her place.
- *Issue 2: Are there different expectations or protocols for participating in the EC meeting press conference with an expanded membership? (i.e., are there different rules for speaking, different rules of participation?)*
  Issue Decision: If an individual attends with the purpose of representing his or her jurisdiction, he or she is expected/permitted to speak. However, all signatories should try to send their highest ranking person possible.

Decision 10: Governance Document
- o *Issue 1: What is the development process for a new governance document? (a) GIT 6 updates current governance document based on PSC decisions, MB approves, (b) PSC approves*
  - **Issue Decision**: A brand new governance document will be developed, which the Principals' Staff Committee will approve.
- o *Issue 2: What is the schedule for completing the document? (a) To be completed prior to signing Agreement, (b) Completed within 6 months of signing of Agreement*
  - **Issue Decision**: The Partnering Leadership and Management Goal Implementation Team (GIT 6) will craft decisions from the February 28, 2014 Principals' Staff Committee meeting into a 5-10 page conceptual draft for review and approval by the Principals' Staff Committee before signing the agreement if possible.
- o *Issue 3: How should the governance document be addressed in the Agreement (i.e. are there specific items that need to be mentioned?)*
  - **Issue Decision**: The governance document does not need to be addressed in the Agreement.
- o *Issue 4: What is the process in the meantime? (e.g. WQ GIT is now developing their own governance document, applicable only to the WQ GIT.)*
  - **Issue Decision**: Decisions made at the February 28, 2014 Principals' Staff Committee meeting will govern how the Chesapeake Bay Program operates in the meantime.

Action: Actions and decisions from the February 28, 2014 Principals' Staff Committee meeting will be distributed for member review by Wednesday, March 6th. Members should submit revisions by Tuesday March 11th. Final decisions will be circulated the week of March 10, 2014.

Update on Public Review Period And Timeline
Action: Distribute the Issues Resolution Committee roster to Principals' Staff Committee members.
Action: Send out date options for 2-day Principals' Staff Committee comment consideration retreat.
Action: Post jurisdiction listening session dates on chesapeakebay.net.