



## **Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee**

### **OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES**

**(Adopted December 10, 2002)**

**(Revised March 2020)**

### ***OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES***

#### **I. STAC MECHANISMS**

##### **A. STANDING WORKGROUP**

A Standing Workgroup is a group appointed by the STAC to address major CBP scientific and technical issues. Standing Workgroups hold regular meetings, present findings/plans and recommendations to the STAC for endorsement, communicate findings to the CBP, and make recommendations to the STAC for further action. Standing Workgroups utilize workshops, reviews, white papers, literature syntheses, etc., to assist them in their work. All workgroups should strive to have a STAC member or alternate as Chair. Mission statements are determined by STAC and workgroup membership is drawn from the region's scientific and technical community. The STAC Chair and Executive Board review/approve the Standing Workgroup role, membership, and performance each year to determine the need for its continuance.

##### **B. *AD HOC* WORKGROUP**

Ad Hoc workgroups are formed to tackle a specific issue and, if initiated by the CBP or a formal response from the CBP is required, follow the STAC Review Protocol. Appointed by the STAC Chair or by a STAC Standing Workgroup chair, ad hoc workgroups have a charge, a sunset clause, and a leader drawn from the STAC membership or the STAC Standing Workgroup membership. Members are drawn from the region's scientific and technical community. Ad hoc workgroups present their findings to the STAC for endorsement (some will present to Standing Workgroups first). Their findings may take the form of a white paper, report card, literature synthesis, prioritized research recommendations, or other mechanisms. Publications must be approved by the STAC and follow the terms outlined in the STAC Publications Protocol.

##### **C. STAC STAFF**

STAC staff members are funded through the CBP to support STAC activities. They

coordinate meetings, workshops and conferences, manage literature syntheses, organize peer review committees, provide technical editing, design, and layout for publications and the STAC website, and act as liaisons between CBP committees and STAC members. Staff support may be provided to help STAC members coordinate relevant STAC projects and activities.

## **II. STAC PROCEDURES**

### **A. PROACTIVE MECHANISMS/PRODUCTS**

The STAC works proactively when possible to strengthen the scientific and technical foundations of CBP activities.

**1. Workshop** - STAC proactive workshops are an important opportunity for the committee to identify and address emerging issues of concern to the management of the Chesapeake Bay ecosystem. In this way, STAC provides guidance on new issues and strengthens the scientific and technical foundations of CBP activities. For additional information see the STAC Workshop Protocol.

**2. Literature Synthesis/White Paper** - A STAC literature synthesis or white paper, facilitates CBP scientific communication and outreach by: (1) summarizing what is understood about an issue based on published scientific and technical information, (2) identifying information gaps to be addressed, and/or (3) recommending to CBP managers ways to utilize existing information in CBP restoration efforts. The STAC selects topics from recommendations by its members, CBP technical subcommittees, CBP managers and other sources. Final reports follow the STAC Publication Protocol.

## **III. RESPONSIVE MECHANISMS/PRODUCTS**

The STAC will evaluate requests from the CBP for topical reviews and workshops and reserves the right to decline or modify requests. All requests for STAC topical reviews must be generated by the CBP's Management Board or Executive Council and submitted by the Chair of either respective group.

### **A. RAPID RESPONSE TECHNICAL REVIEW**

Scientific and technical advisories will be prepared by STAC in response to requests from the CBP after review and approval by the STAC Executive Board. Advisories will be prepared by a subset of STAC members and/or a group of independent individuals with appropriate expertise. By design, these advisories will involve a limited number of individuals, occur in relatively short time frames, and generate concise and focused reports. The goal is to provide access to the best available scientific/technical input.

### **B. MERIT REVIEW**

Scientific and technical evaluations of programs, proposals, products or processes, usually are initiated by requests from the CBP. In a STAC review, the full STAC membership reviews, discusses, and votes to endorse (or not endorse) the item under consideration. Alternatively, a subset of STAC members and/or a group of Bay region individuals with appropriate expertise may be convened by STAC to

review the item under consideration and make recommendations. Merit reviews have two main elements:

**1. Proposal Review** - Technical review of proposals to evaluate their technical merit and relevance to CBP objectives.

**2. Evaluation Report** - A formal, independent evaluation of specific CBP activities in relation to current scientific and technical knowledge. Written by a STAC member or members and approved by STAC, such reports evaluate and summarize specific CBP activities and offer recommendations.

Additional process guidance for STAC Merit Reviews is available in the STAC Review Protocols.

#### **IV. CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

An objective of the STAC is to avoid any direct conflicts of interest or the appearance of conflicts of interest in matters related to policy recommendations and decisions on funding by the CBP. The major area of concern for direct conflicts of interest relates to situations where a member, alternate member, or employing organization would benefit from the decision and has a substantial role in the decision. Employment ties by the individual or spouse, investments in an organization, positions of authority or responsibility, or other areas of benefit relate to a conflict of interest determination.

##### **A. Circumstances in which there is a great potential for conflict, where a member or alternate member should not participate in the rating of a proposal:**

1. There is a direct financial benefit to the individual involved in the ranking;
2. Funding would go directly to the organization where one is employed and to the specific position/functional area in which one works.

\* If either of these circumstances exists, the member or alternate member shall recuse himself or herself from voting on that proposal and avoid any direct comment on it during discussions.

##### **B. Circumstances in which there is a low potential for conflict, where a member or alternate member may participate in the rating of a proposal; (after declaring their apparent conflict to the Chair):**

1. Organization in which one is employed, is a recipient of the funding, but there is no direct link to the position/functional area of the individual;
2. Member or alternate member is the originator of the proposal or idea, but their organization is not the direct recipient of any funding under it;
3. Name of member or alternate member appears on the proposal but there is no direct benefit to the individual or organization of employment.

STAC members and activity participants represent their area of expertise while serving the STAC, not their employing organizations.

## **V. EXPENSES**

**A. Expenses** - All members serve without compensation. Members may be reimbursed at the government approved per diem rate for personal vehicle mileage (excluding state vehicles) and meal costs (except alcoholic beverages). Members may also be reimbursed for the following expenses related to attending official STAC functions upon submission of the appropriate documentation: transportation costs (except for international travel), rental car expenses (including gas), lodging, tolls, and parking. Federal government members will be reimbursed by their agency. STAC members must complete a travel voucher and receipts must be included. The reimbursement voucher must include an actual or digital signature (printed names cannot not be processed). Long distance telephone calls for official STAC business may be reimbursed if documentation is provided. Alternate members may receive reimbursement only when the respective regular member is not present.

## **VI. AMENDMENTS TO OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES**

The STAC Executive Board and/or membership establishes the STAC Operational Guidelines and can create and alter them as necessary with a majority vote.

## **STAC Publication Protocol**

### **Amended March 2020**

#### **Introduction**

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) produces, in a variety of formats, documents which are designed to provide scientific information and recommendations to the Chesapeake Bay Program (CBP), the public, and restoration partners throughout the Bay's watershed. Due to the importance of reliable, accurate scientific information for the effective management of the Chesapeake Bay, STAC is committed to producing the highest quality technical information, and employs the following procedures in the production of all scientific publications. All recipients of STAC publication funding must agree to adhere to the protocols outlined below.

#### **STAC Reports**

STAC reports are an important mechanism used to convey scientific information and recommendations presented during STAC workshops, reviews, workgroup discussions, and STAC meetings to the CBP, the public, and restoration partners throughout the Bay's watershed.

#### **PROTOCOL**

1. For any STAC report identified as a deliverable, it is the sole responsibility of the steering committee, workgroup, or review team to develop and complete the report.
2. Professional editorial services are generally not provided for the production of STAC reports unless funding is requested and approved for these services in the proposal or additional funding is identified.
3. Prior to a workshop or review, the steering committee, workgroup, or review team will submit a proposal (See STAC Review Protocol, STAC Workshop Protocol, and STAC Current Year Request for Proposal) that will include the proposed completion date of all publications. The Executive Board must approve the completion date. Any requests for extensions to the completion date must be submitted by the steering committee, workgroup, or review team to the Executive Board for approval.
4. Prior to the workshop or review, the Steering Committee should identify potential programmatic partners in the Chesapeake Bay Program Partnership, or other relevant organizations. These partners will be the targets for the report recommendations and should participate in workshop planning. STAC Staff, STAC Executive Secretary, and STAC-CBP Liaison should assist in identifying the relevant and advantageous partners.
5. Workshop and review recommendations should be clearly outlined in the Executive Summary of the final report. Programmatic reports should follow the SPURR format

6. Before submitting a final report to STAC staff, the draft report should be reviewed by all parties deemed necessary and appropriate by the report author(s), including the steering committee, workshop participants, STAC members, and relevant experts.
7. For any STAC report compiled for a workshop, review or other activity, STAC will vote to endorse a final editorial authority. The final editorial authority must be one of the following: 1) the STAC representative(s) on a review or workshop committee; 2) the STAC Executive Board; or 3) a majority of the entire STAC membership. Note, please see STAC Review Protocols for attaching letters of support or letters of alternative opinions.
8. STAC staff will conduct a final editorial review before publication and dissemination of the final report. Significant editorial changes made during this review will be submitted to the author(s) for approval prior to publication and distribution.
9. The final report findings and recommendations are to be presented to 1-5 Chesapeake Bay Program Goal Implementation Teams or other programmatic partners. Following this, the recommendations should be presented to the Chesapeake Bay Program Management Board and request feedback on the incorporation of recommendations.
10. All reports are published and distributed in electronic format and will be made available to any interested party via the STAC website. Should significant, justifiable need arise for hardcopies, the report author(s) may request hard copy publication funding from the STAC Executive Board or include costs of hardcopy publication in their activity proposal. The STAC Executive Board will make a decision based upon need and the availability of STAC publication funds. Hardcopy publications are generally published in black and white with the exception of a color cover. Full color copies of the report are available electronically via the STAC website.
11. Workshop leads should work with STAC Staff, programmatic partners, and the CBP Communications Workgroup to identify outlets to increase communication and outreach for the workshop and its recommendations. This can include an article in local news outlets, blog post on the CBP website, inclusion in program newsletters, or additional presentations to relevant groups. Development of additional resources may be required to disseminate findings to a non-technical audience (i.e. fact sheet, handout, poster, visuals).

### **STAC Factsheets**

STAC factsheets are an effective tool available to distill and disseminate important scientific and technical information and recommendations to audiences that may not be accessed through the use of a STAC report. STAC factsheets may only be developed in addition to STAC reports.

### **PROTOCOL**

1. Steering committees, workgroups, or review teams wishing to develop a factsheet should incorporate a request for a factsheet in their activity proposal. The request should include intended audience and justified need.
2. Pending STAC approval, professional editorial services can be provided to assist author(s) in editing, layout, and design. Within three weeks following the workshop, the author(s) must provide the editor with detailed and specific guidance on intended audience, desired content, appropriate graphics, background information, references, and data before the editor begins assembling the factsheet.
3. The editor will create a draft version of the factsheet for review within three weeks of receipt of all materials requested to complete the document. This deadline also assumes availability of the lead person for the factsheet to address questions and concerns during its development.
4. The STAC representative or identified activity lead as well as STAC staff may work with the editor to make minor editorial changes before publication and distribution of the factsheet.
5. The finalized factsheet should be submitted to STAC staff for publication and distribution.
6. All factsheets are published and distributed in electronic format and will be made available to any interested party via the STAC website. Should significant, justifiable need arise for hardcopies, the report author(s) may request hard copy publication funding from the STAC Executive Board or include costs of hardcopy publication in their activity proposal. The STAC Executive Board will make a decision based upon need and the availability of STAC publication funds.

### **STAC Media Briefs**

STAC media briefs are intended to relay newsworthy information to the broader public on scientific discoveries or management recommendations emerging from STAC activities. Media briefs are to be developed alongside a STAC report or factsheet, and will be produced for any activity that STAC deems worthy or necessary.

#### **PROTOCOL**

1. Requests for media briefs must be submitted by the STAC representative or activity lead to the STAC Executive Secretary.
2. Pending STAC Executive Secretary approval, professional writing and editorial services can be provided.

3. The activity lead will work with STAC staff to draft a media brief within two weeks of completing the activity. The activity lead and STAC staff will provide a draft media brief to the STAC Executive Secretary for final approval.
4. The STAC Executive Secretary must approve the completed media brief before it is disseminated by STAC staff to regional media outlets and posted on the STAC website.



# **STAC Review Protocol**

## **Introduction**

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) supports the scientific and technical basis of the Chesapeake Bay Program (CBP) through the independent peer review of technical reports, policy statements, and activities. The objective of these reviews is to provide thorough, competent, and objective STAC approved technical reviews in a timely fashion. Priorities for STAC usually emphasize reviews at the broad program level and development of advice on major issues.

## **Merit Reviews of Budget Proposals**

The merit review is an important element of Chesapeake Bay Program operations and STAC remains committed to advising on how to obtain the best scientific and technical information. Due to budget limitations and STAC decisions, STAC does not conduct reviews of individual budget proposals for each CBP governance unit.

1. STAC can assist the CBP infrastructure in their annual budget proposal merit reviews by identifying potential reviewers, and providing advice and guidance on the review process as necessary.
2. The CBP governance units are responsible for contacting potential reviewers, distributing the review material, and compiling and assessing the results of the review for consideration during the selection process.
3. STAC conducts peer reviews following conflict of interest protocols.

## **Programmatic Reviews Addressing On-going CBP Efforts and Special Reviews of Major New Plans or Issues.**

The purpose of Programmatic Reviews is to provide a technical peer review of ongoing CBP activities, identifying areas of merit, needed improvement, and concern. Special Reviews are conducted to provide guidance and advice before new programs are implemented by the CBP. The purpose is to review the new program for potential problems or conflicts and make recommendations based on the findings.

1. Requests for STAC programmatic reviews are generated by the CBP's Management Board or Executive Council. A request, directed to the attention of the STAC Chair, should indicate whether an external peer review or a STAC review is desired, the required completion date of the review, the preferred form of the final report, and an anticipated date for official response by the CBP to STAC to meet EPA peer review requirements for influential or highly influential scientific information.

2. STAC convenes a review panel of qualified experts, from within STAC membership and outside institutions. A STAC member can be appointed by the STAC chair to oversee the review process.
3. STAC develops a charge to the review panel, which is submitted to the Chesapeake Bay Program for concurrence and verification.
4. STAC reviews must be presented to the STAC membership by the review panel and approved by STAC before release.
5. STAC transmits the findings of the review panel to the CBP, with a formal request for response to include a due date for response by CBP.
6. All review products are subject to the STAC Publications Protocol.
7. Following the transmission of the review, the STAC Chair will supervise any responses or justified revisions in the report, in consultation with reviewers, the STAC Executive Board, and STAC members as appropriate.
8. If CBP requests a STAC review, the CBP is expected to respond to the STAC's recommendations, in writing, within 90 days of receiving the review report, and respond at a STAC quarterly meeting within six months of receiving the review report. If STAC requests a review, the CBP response format will be dealt with on a case by case basis.
9. Review products, and CBP responses to the review products (comment-response documents) are made available to the public. STAC also reserves the right to create additional public documents, such as factsheets or press releases, from the review products.

#### Amendments to Review Protocols

The STAC Executive Board and/or membership establishes the STAC Review Protocols and can create and alter them as necessary with a majority vote.

# **STAC Workshop Protocol**

## **Mission Statement**

Workshops are a primary mechanism by which the Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) of the Chesapeake Bay Program (CBP) brings the broad expertise of the scientific and technical community to bear on critical and timely issues relevant to the successful restoration of the Chesapeake Bay.

Workshops (Proactive or Responsive) are initiated from within STAC or by the CBP, and are convened for a number of purposes, including:

- To review the state of the science or technology in a topical area of importance to the future condition of the Chesapeake Bay;
- To identify important areas of research, technology development, or data collection and analysis to further the goals of the CBP and to suggest strategies to advance these efforts;
- To investigate emerging science issues which merit greater scientific attention within the CBP, and suggest strategies for initiating or enhancing efforts in these areas; or
- To be responsive to science-based questions from the CBP, and develop strategies in support of improved science in response to the management needs of the CBP

STAC workshops convene independent experts, active managers, scientists, and stakeholders with interests and expertise in a dialogue to exchange ideas, and outline strategies in support of improved science in Chesapeake Bay restoration. The resulting workshop product, in the form of a written report, provides a format for formulating recommendations and guidance from the scientific and technical community to the CBP Partnership and other interested parties implementing restoration, conducting research and technology development, or collecting and analyzing data regarding the Bay and its watershed. STAC workshops are designed to maintain high scientific standards in the consideration, review, and implementation of scientific information in the restoration efforts of the Chesapeake Bay region.

STAC is focusing its limited resources in convening workshops that have outcomes specific to management actions to assist the restoration of the Bay and its watershed. Hence, workshops are one of several processes that the CBP community should be pursuing to expand science-based management for the region's restoration. In particular, they are not intended to be meetings aimed primarily at enhancing coordination across the Chesapeake Bay community; alternative options exist for such functions. For that reason, STAC requests that all those proposing workshops adhere to the following protocols, and fulfill the additional requirements outlined for STAC Proactive or Responsive Workshops:

## **PROTOCOL**

1. The number of workshops sponsored is constrained by the available funding. A Request for Proposals (RFP) is released by STAC in December of each year, inviting submission of workshop topics for **Proactive** and **Responsive** activities (see additional requirements below). Recommended workshop themes are selected annually by the STAC membership. Additional responsive activities from the CBP will be approved on a case-by-case basis.
2. Workshops, but not workshop products, must be completed in the fiscal year for which they are approved. The STAC fiscal year runs from June 1 – May 31.
3. Workshop proposals must be submitted to STAC for approval by the full committee. Proposals must follow the Request for Proposal (RFP) guidelines and include all of the materials listed below for their respective workshop category. **Failure to adequately justify the workshop and its products as an appropriate activity for STAC support, and as a reasonable next step in the development and use of the products in management in the region could lead to return of the proposal without further action.** The STAC Executive Board/RFP Review Committee has the discretion to waive or add requirements as needed.
4. A steering committee, **not to exceed ten individuals**, must be identified by the workshop requestor(s) with at least one current STAC member identified as part of the steering committee. **Requestor(s) must obtain written consent that the identified STAC member(s) agree to serve on the steering committee and fulfill the accompanying responsibilities.** The STAC representative may serve as chair of the steering committee but it is not required for a workshop. Additionally, if the workshop topic or resulting product will be of relevance to a particular entity, requestor(s) are encouraged to include a representative from that entity on the steering committee.
5. The workshop steering committee must include the STAC Coordinator and/or Staff in all teleconferences, meetings, email correspondence, etc. for the workshop. The steering committee is responsible for the following tasks during the workshop process:
  - Drafting background information, pre-workshop CBP activities, and post-workshop use of workshop results or recommendations in CBP restoration that justify a workshop as an appropriate ‘next step’ in exploration of the topic’s importance to science-based management in the CBP;
  - Oversight of all aspects of the workshop, including the workshop proposal;
  - Development of workshop agenda and objectives;
  - Identification of key participants, with the number of participants invited to the workshop determined by the function of the session;
  - Determination of the criteria for selecting which, if any, participants in the workshop should receive travel funding from the approved workshop budget;

- Identification of key recipients, including the CBP committees, Goal Implementation Teams (GIT), workgroups, or other task forces and individuals, who would be encouraged to adopt workshop outcomes and recommendations into future decisions, management, and policy;
  - Identification of CBP staff to provide additional logistical and/or technical support for the workshop;
  - Development of workshop proceedings and/or products and their timely submission to STAC for review and publication\* (See additional details below);
  - Presentations to key Chesapeake Bay Program GITs, workgroups, or partner organizations who could take action on workshop recommendations
  - Final presentation to the Management Board and requesting of response, if relevant
  - Compliance with the allocated STAC budget, not to exceed the funds approved and allocated by STAC.
6. STAC Staff will provide logistical support for the workshops, or can arrange for independent support as needed. Workshop leads are requested to respond to inquiries from STAC Staff within 48 hours, or risk delay in the completion of task, and jeopardize the goals of the workshop.
  7. The steering committee will be assigned a web page accessible through the STAC website for document distribution and information sharing among steering committee members, workshop participants, and interested parties. The steering committee will be responsible for maintaining accurate posted information with technical support provided by the STAC Staff.
  8. Registration fees may not be charged for workshop participants unless approved in advance by the STAC Executive Secretary.
  9. The STAC Executive Secretary is the only person authorized to execute contracts and only verbal or written offers issued by the STAC Executive Secretary will be honored. **It is atypical for STAC to support funding for Honoraria and/or consultation fees, but if approved by STAC, these funds must be written into the workshop proposal.** The monetary amount will not exceed the allowable amount identified in CRC's cooperative agreement.
  10. The total amount allocated by STAC will not exceed \$10,000 for each workshop activity. While STAC frequently accepts requests as the sole funding source, **if external contributors or fiscal partners are willing to contribute matching funds, these must be identified and the disbursement of funds clearly outlined prior to final workshop approval.**
  11. A written report must be developed by the workshop steering committee following any workshop activity. The steering committee may request press releases or factsheets as additional products to the completed written report, but must assist in their development.

Workshop publications, reports, and proceedings are subject to the *STAC Publication Protocol* (available online at [www.chesapeake.org/stac](http://www.chesapeake.org/stac)).

12. The report's overall format and length must adhere to the standardized report format generated by STAC, however, content will vary based on specific workshop activities. All drafts prior to the final version must be developed in Microsoft Word file format. The report must summarize workshop findings and actionable recommendations in the SPURR format.
13. Workshop reports must be completed and forwarded to STAC for review **no more than 90 days** after the completion of the workshop. STAC Staff will work with the steering committee following the workshop to develop a timeline for report drafting to help ensure timely completion, unless an alternate schedule has been identified in the proposal and approved by STAC.
14. Final review, distribution, and web posting will be completed by STAC Staff within six weeks of receipt of the workshop report unless an alternate deadline is approved by STAC.
15. STAC reserves the right to release workshop products to the public. STAC also reserves the right to create additional public documents, such as factsheets or press releases, from workshop products.
16. **Failure to meet reporting deadlines or follow protocols may jeopardize future workshop funding and timely integration of products into management decision-making.**

### **STAC Proactive Workshops**

STAC Proactive Workshops are an important opportunity for the committee to identify and address issues of concern that have evolved through time in discussions within the CBP partnership, i.e., its committees, Goal Implementation Teams (GITs), workgroups, and action teams. The issues may not have been identified as priorities by the Chesapeake Bay Program but represent topics that the larger community believes the CBP should address in the management of the ecosystem. In this way, STAC provides guidance on emerging issues and strengthens the scientific and technical foundations of CBP activities for development and incorporation of these issues into management considerations for future Bay and watershed restoration.

Workshop proposals requested by individual STAC members in collaboration with any CBP partner or research institution or STAC workgroups are considered proactive.

A successful proposal should be no more than three pages in length and should include the

following information, in addition to adhering to the above Workshop Protocols:

Content:

- Workshop topic and/or title;
- List of steering committee members with affiliations representing necessary expertise needs, with written consent from STAC member(s) indicated for inclusion (not part of the 3-page limit). Clearly identify the workshop chair/lead(s);
- Description of workshop topic(s), objective(s), and degree of urgency;
- Relevant background information for the workshop topic(s), current issues related to the topic(s), and substantial detail on previous CBP discussions and deliberations on the topic (if applicable);
- Relevance to management needs: A list of key linkages between the proposed workshop topic and current CBP Management Strategies, Workplans, 2017 Mid-Point Assessment goals, outcomes, and/or other STAC activities and priorities;
- Rationale as to why a STAC workshop is an appropriate vehicle for the proposed activity;
- A specific set of questions that will be addressed at the workshop, indicating the scientific or technical question, issues, or topics that will be considered;
- List of anticipated speakers/moderators/key participants with affiliations, with emphasis on the expertise needed for advancement of the issue or skills in implementing recommendations in science-based management (if available). Proposal may also outline topics for which speakers will be sought;
- Detailed description of workshop outcomes/product(s) that meet the requirements outlined in the *STAC Publications Protocol*, and a statement of how the product(s) will be applied to inform future CBP management decisions and/or science-based management across the CBP Partnership;
- A brief history of previous STAC-funded workshops applied for by the individual or workgroup, and how previous workshop products were used to support management decisions.

Logistics:

- Anticipated timing of workshop, and **whether this timing is firm or flexible** based on goals of workshop;
- Estimated timeline for setting up and convening workshop, and producing workshop product(s). If you anticipate up front that the 90 day report deadline cannot be met, please provide in the proposal an alternative timeline for report submission to STAC with justification; if during the workshop process the 90-day deadline becomes unfeasible, advance notice must be provided to STAC for approval;
- Estimated number of participants, facilities needed, desired location, and anticipated budget (while STAC workshops can vary greatly in cost, STAC typically estimates each workshop costs between \$5,000 and \$10,000);
- The disbursement of travel support funds will be at the discretion of the steering committee. However, it is expected that speakers that will contribute scientific or subject

matter expertise needed to achieve the goals and outcomes of the workshop and authors of the workshop report will be given first priority. All remaining travel funds will be dispersed at the discretion of the steering committee. **(Note: STAC travel support may not be used to support expenses incurred by Federal employees);**

- List of any additional potential fiscal partners supporting the workshop, including a detailed outline of funding limitations and disbursement information.

### **STAC Responsive Workshops**

STAC Responsive Workshops are held in direct response to requests for assistance from the Chesapeake Bay Program Partnership. STAC provides support to convene the workshops in order to gather critically needed information on a topic that has been developed through prior deliberations and discussions within the CBP committees, GITs, workgroups, or action teams. These workshops provide a flexible response mechanism to provide additional scientific and technical information and guidance on high priority issues that have been extensively explored within the partnership as they arise in the management of the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

Workshop proposals requested by any CBP partner or committee are considered responsive, including (but not limited to): any Bay jurisdiction; any CBP-GIT (Goal Implementation Team); Local Government Advisory Committee; Citizens' Advisory Committee; Chesapeake Bay Commission; Management Board; and Executive Council. Proposals must be made in collaboration with a current STAC member.

A successful proposal should include the above requirements for Proactive Workshops, in addition, a Responsive Workshop proposal requires:

**An individualized letter in support of the proposed workshop activity, degree of urgency, anticipated products and estimated delivery dates; endorsed with signature(s) of lead representatives of the group or agency that will benefit directly from the activity – e.g. the Chair of any CBP committee or GIT, jurisdiction's governor or mayor, or by a state agency staff/deputy secretary (not included in the three-page limit).**

---

### Amendments to Workshop Protocols

The STAC Executive Board and/or membership establish the STAC Workshop Protocols and can create and alter them as necessary with a majority vote.