

Decisions from the February 5 2020 PEP Joint Policy and Management Committees Meeting

Organizational Structure, Governance Procedures and Guiding Principles for the Peconic Estuary Partnership

DECISION: PEP Policy Committee and Management Committee members and TAC, CAC, and LGC chairs will submit comments on the draft *Organizational Structure, Governance Procedures and Guiding Principles for the Peconic Estuary Partnership* document to Joyce Novak by March 6. The TAC, CAC and LGC chairs will work with the members of their respective committees to seek comments on the Committee specific sections of the larger draft document. PEP Office Staff will distribute a MS Word version of the draft document to Policy Committee and Management Committee members and the TAC, CAC and LGC Chairs with an ask that they provide their comments in the form of MS Word Track Changes to the draft document. PEP office staff will distribute revised draft document along with documentation responding to all the comments received to the Management Committee in advance of their April meeting. The Management Committee will present their recommended final draft *Organizational Structure, Governance Procedures and Guiding Principles for the Peconic Estuary Partnership* document to the Policy Committee for review and final approval and adoption at the May 6 Policy Committee meeting.

Policy and Management Committee members and Advisory Committee chairs comments during the meeting which will need to be addressed in the revised draft document include the following:

- Reflect the host entity in the Peconic Estuary Partnership Management Structure (page 4).
- Reflect the interactions between the three advisory committees in the Peconic Estuary Partnership Governance Process in Figure 2 (page 5).
- Correct the text to reflect that the Peconic Estuary Partnership Policy Committee itself does not approve contracts but rather approved budget allocations to fund such contracts (page 8).
- Revise the text of the second bullet on page 8—“Participates as an equal partner with host entity in selection/hiring/termination of PEP Director” to reflect the fact that it’s the Policy Committee which has the responsibility for the selection/hiring/termination of the PEP Director, in consultation with the host entities.
- Ensure the term “host entity” is used consistently throughout the document.
- Reflect the need to provide the Technical Advisory Committee with the ability to both have a defined set of recognized voting members as well as the ability to include other technical and scientific experts in the work of the Committee and its consensus decision making process.
- Reflect need for all committees to have recognized core group of voting members.
- Avoid placing a minimum number of required meetings for each committee. Meetings should be conducted on an as needed and when relevant basis with a consideration of joint meetings, in the interest of time efficiency for both PEP Staff and Committee members.
- Ensure the chairs and the members of the Local Governments Committee, Citizens Advisory Committee and Technical Advisory Committee all have the opportunity to review and comment on their committees’ respective sections within the draft document on pages 10-13.

- Add roles and responsibilities of the Natural Resources Subcommittee to the document and to the organizational chart.
- Edit the text on page 14 to read “Assures the ~~autonomy~~ and public visibility of the Partnership Office.” The responsibility of assuring the autonomy of the Partnership Office should be added to the Policy Committee’s responsibilities.
- Edit the text on page 14 to read “Develops a strategic financial long-term funding plan ~~and fundraising strategy to raise funds and develop grant applications~~ for CCMP implementation in consultation with the Policy and Management Committees”.
- Add text to the document reflecting that separate Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) and agreements spell out the identity of the host entity(s) and further roles and responsibilities and interrelationships not documented within this document and that those separate MOUs and agreements need to be, in turn, fully consistent with the content of the organizational, governance and guiding principles document.
- Statement on page 15 about all staff members reporting to the Program Office on a daily basis needs to be re-worded to accurately reflect State Coordinator position and current agreements
- Discussion of existing MOUs will be necessary to move forward on the requested changes in the Governance Structure document.
- In the Quorum section on page 6, it should be clarified that in the statement “the presence of a majority of all members” that the majority is 50% or more of all members.
- In the Meeting Summaries section on page 7, it should be changed to state the “A written summary of each meeting will be prepared by the Partnership’s office staff, reviewed and approved by the Chair and voting members of the committee, and posted on the Partnership’s website within two weeks of each meeting and approved by the full membership at the following committee meeting”.
- Add text that allows the ability for each committee to have a Vice Chair to lead in the absence of the Chair.
- Allow the ability for the PEP to host a closed meeting similar to an “executive meeting”.
- Chairs or members that are quoted in the meeting minutes should have the opportunity to review prior to public consumption.
- Add in Ethics/Conflict of Interest statement.

Report out from Task Force convened to evaluate partnership needs and host entity for review, discussion and agreement on next steps

DECISION: The Task Force has not completed its work on developing its recommendations in response to the charge from the Policy Committee in time for the February 5 meeting. The Task Force needs more time to complete its work. The Policy Committee agreed to consider inviting Peter Scully as needed into the discussions held by the Task Force formed at the October 9th Leadership Retreat; to provide historical knowledge of Suffolk County’s host relationship with the PEP. Peter Scully agreed to help the Task Force where he could; no change was made to the Task Force membership. The Task Force will deliver a more fleshed out list of pros and cons and a more realistic listing of options and the timeframes involved to the Policy Committee in advance of their May 6 meeting. The Task Force will

likely be recommending both short term and much longer timeframes for implementation of its recommendations.

Draft formal agreement for review, discussion, agreement on next steps

DECISION: PEP Policy Committee and Management Committee members and TAC, CAC, and LGC chairs will submit comments on the draft formal recommitment agreement to Joyce Novak by March 6. PEP Office Staff will distribute a MS Word version of the draft formal recommitment agreement to Policy Committee and Management Committee members and the TAC, CAC, and LGC Chairs with an ask that they provide their comments in the form of MS Word Track Changes to the draft document. PEP office staff will distribute revised draft formal recommitment agreement along with documentation responding to all the comments received to the Management Committee in advance of their April meeting. The Management Committee will present their recommended final draft formal recommitment agreement to the Policy Committee for review and final approval at their May 6 meeting.

Update on development of numeric goals, feedback and next steps

DECISION: The Policy Committee approved the Technical Advisory Committee's recommended series of water quality indicators and associated numerical goals. The Technical Advisory Committee's recommended "concentrations of enterococcus should not exceed 104 colony-forming units (cfu)/100 mL" was changed to 35 colony-forming units (cfu)/100 mL to be fully consistent with EPA's recommended criterion values, pending EPA clarification. The Technical Advisory Committee will continue to work on developing additional indicators and associated numerical goals to provide the public with a more complete picture of a healthy Peconic Estuary and Watershed. These developments will influence the draft Peconic Estuary Story. Data presentation through a STOPLIGHT color coded format will be further tailored to meet the needs of target audiences. Reconsider the language that defines 'Clean Water' so that it does not confuse the public or misinform. The Technical Advisory Committee will continue to work with Management Committee and any recommended changes or additions to these approved indicators and numerical goal will be presented to the Policy Committee for review and final decisions.

Update, feedback and next steps on communications plan for the public

DECISION: The Policy Committee agreed to move forward with the draft announcement for the September 25 Peconic Conference, working to firm up the target audiences and revise the messaging. The PEP Education and Outreach Coordinator will share the Conference save the date and Conference title alternatives via email to the Management and Policy Committee for review and comment with an anticipated deadline to send out the save the date by the end of February/beginning of March. The Conference Invitation and messaging will be developed by PEP Director and staff in consultation with the Citizens Advisory Committee Chair. The draft Conference invitation and messaging will be shared the Management and Policy Committee via email in April for review and comment and for review and

approval via email in May by the Management and Policy Committee. Formal Conference invitations will be distributed in May.

Finance plan outline for discussion and agreement on next steps

DECISION: The draft Finance Plan will be edited in consultation with the Policy Committee Chair and the Environmental Finance Center. Policy and Management Committee members will provide Joyce Novak with their comments and feedback on the updated draft finance plan by April 1st. Joyce will respond to those comments and share a revised draft finance plan with the Management Committee for review and discussion at their April meeting. The Management Committee will forward their recommended revised draft final finance plan to the Policy Committee for consideration and feedback at their May 6th meeting.

First draft outline of annual work plan for review, feedback, and direction

DECISION: Policy Committee agreed with the Partnership Director's recommendation for basing the annual workplan and budget based on the updated CCMP. The draft annual workplan and budget will be presented to the Management Committee at their April meeting. The Management Committee will present their recommended revised draft annual workplan and budget to the Policy Committee for review and decisions at their May 6 meeting.

Agreement on issues for discussion/decision at the May 6, 2020 Policy Committee meeting

DECISION: The following items were identified as topics for the May 6, 2020 Policy Committee meeting agenda:

- Review and approval of the revised final draft *Organizational Structure, Governance Procedures and Guiding Principles for the Peconic Estuary Partnership*
- Review of Task Force's recommended pros and cons and short and long term options, if available at that time
- Review and feedback on revised draft re-commitment agreement
- Updates on the September 25 Peconic Conference public messaging
- Review and feedback on draft Peconic Estuary Story messaging
- Review and approval of the Technical Advisory Committee's recommended Peconic Estuary and Watershed Water Quality Monitoring Strategy
- Review and action on revised draft Partnership finance plan
- Review and approval of the final PEP annual workplan and budget