**ATTENDANCE:**

* Carl Hershner
* Doreen Vetter
* Greg Allen
* Mike Fritz
* Mike Mason
* Nita Sylvester
* Scott Phillips
* Tim Wilke

**ACTION ITEMS:**

* **Carl will send out a “Guiding Principles” document to DFIW members by July 3rd regarding the questions being used with the “GITs’ preliminary goal statements. Comments will be due back to Carl by July 9th. Carl will then send it back out to the DFIW by July 11th to allow for 2 days of review before the July 13th DFIW meeting.**
* **Tim Wilke will send Carl (and copy Nita) a list of attendance from GIT, MB and PSC meetings over the past one and a half years. This is due before the July 27th meeting.**

**SUMMARY**

* Meeting Materials available at mtg webpage: <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/18403/>
* Approved [summary of 6/15/12 DFIW mtg](http://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/18402/dfiw_mtg_summary_061512.docx)
* Discussed responses to action item from the 6/15/12 DFIW mtg (Carl asked the DFIW GIT mentors to answer the questions that were provided to the MB on 6/13/12 related to GITs’ preliminary goal statements).
	+ The MB was to provide any changes to the questions. Carl has only received a response from Peyton. The substance of the questions remains largely unchanged. The MB also agreed to consider the goals of the STAR during this exercise and Scott Phillips provided the preliminary goal statements for STAR to Carl.
	+ Regarding the DFIW mentors’ task to answer the q’s, Carl received responses for the following GITs: Habitat, Water Quality, Watersheds, Stewardship, STAR. Carl was surprised that, in general, responses indicate we will need collaboration at a level above the GITs (e.g. at the MB and/or PSC level) to achieve most GIT goals. Carl asked the group to discuss how we can re-word the q’s, or provide some guidance, so that folks don’t feel defensive when responding and will allow for identification of a subset of goals and/or decisions that would require deliberation at a level above the GITs.
	+ As a result of the discussion, Carl will be drafting a “guiding principles” document. After DFIW review/comment/discussion, the plan is to provide to the MB and GIT Chairs in advance of the Aug 2nd MB mtg.
* At the next mtg of the DFIW on 7/13/12, the group will finalize the “guiding principles” document and discuss the attendance of the GIT, MB and PSC mtgs for the past year and a half to see if it can help pinpoint inefficiencies in the decision making process. Tim will provide the attendance lists in advance of the 7/13/12 DFIW mtg.

**Detailed Minutes:**

* The meeting was called to order at 1:05pm.
* Carl: The objective was for us to take a pass at the GIT’s goal statements.
* Carl: Direction was to submit suggested edits to Nita and me. I have only received a set from Peyton Robertson so far.
* Carl: The substance of the questions remains largely unchanged.
* Are there subsets of the group that be more effectively engaged
* Mike Fritz: Maybe there’s a 2 parts or 2 steps to this aspect of it. Objectively asking “what are the dimensions of the most significant added value, and determine where it is determined for decisions. What is the nature of the decisions we expect the Management Board to be making for this process?
* Carl: instead of looking up at the organizational and decision making structure of the CBPO…it makes sense to look at the detailed notes from the GITs….engagement across the partnership can serve multiple purposes…that sort of insight should help inform the DF creation process for the GITs.
* Scott Phillips: we don’t want to states to say “were only going to deal with water quality” and you guys can do the rest.
* Carl: I agree I’m sensitive to that, but I believe that conversation is going to happen no matter what, so we need to be prepared to tackle that and explain how we expect the program to move forward.
* Nita: If a state says “you know what…that’s not important to the partnership”, some of the GITs are afraid “someone above my GIT will suddenly say…”this is no longer a concern for my jurisdiction”…
* Carl: as we plan what a restored bay should look like…we need to plan ahead so we can structure the program so decision making is reflective of the amount of coordination and collaboration that is required…..or lack of approval or decision making if some areas make sense to not have extra management or organization.
* Carl: Many GITs will still work independently in small groups doing lots of work, but some items will truly require cross program collaboration. That’s what we are trying to point out.
* Carl: We need to categorize each activity to see what area it falls under. This may also help ease concerns from the GITs.
* Nita: The GITs have had a lot of freedom the last 2-2.5 years. They are very sensitive to upper level decisions that may hinder or alter their work and membership.
* Scott Phillips: if we can articulate the principal of trying to put the decision making down into the GITs and lower levels of the organization to increase efficiency…move decision making areas where appropriate.
* Carl: one main point is to try and pinpoint the inefficiencies in the decision making process…and highlight where we think some changes can happen in the program. Carl is working with Nita
* ACTION: Tim will send the past attendance from GIT, MB, and PSC meetings from the last few years to pinpoint where the same people are showing up at multiple meetings, and discussing the same data. This will help pinpoint areas where decision making efficiency can improve.
* Carl: this needs to be done in the first 2 weeks of July….if we still plan to present this to the MB on August 2nd.For now we can gather this for our next meeting in 2 weeks and then we can determine if we will move forward and scrap the report depending how positive the report is.
* Fritz: MB will need to address head on…”at the goal level…..is he goal valid….is the GIT’s work resulting in achievement or progress toward achieving this goal? Is this goal a program priority? Are there issues that are going to require a MB or PSC decision/
* Fritz: perhaps we can develop a scale of low level to high level area/interest and pinpoint where decision making should occur…
* Carl: what is the purview and structure of the program…how to do set goals and decisions to appropriately achieve these goals? This is now occurring because we are pressing these groups to be more explicit.
* Carl: my to-do list would be to take a crack at this list of guiding principles…..to try and provide further guidance to the GITs before the august MB meeting…
* Carl: then the longer term…is to take our evaluation of what we have received so far and develop “Socratic questions ---guiding questions” to help the GITs further develop and further refine the decision framework…that’s where I am at this point. How do you rest of you feel about what should come next?
* Scott: maybe we can provide some suggestions to the GIT leaders that clearly define what their mission is…and what the more quantitative goals are under their mission statements…and what are supportive activities in the list of 31. A step forward would be for the GIT leads on August 2nd to say “this is how we are arranged”…instead of saying all 31 things are on the same level…try and divide into the different levels of importance and/or difference of macro-micro scale.
* Nita: Cairn said what she believes the GITs/MB agreed to was….the MB will not pass judgment on any particular goal statements…but rather the discussion will be framed for the MB to focus more on asking questions of clarification. Then the MB’s presentation of their perspective at the next MB meeting after August…
* Carl: goals would not be voted up or down even at the August and September MB meeting…more the beginning of a conversation….very early in the process…
* Scott: The dialogue will continue between the two MB meetings…and not just waiting 6 weeks before even thinking about it again…
* Carl: Scott you added material for STAR. Thanks. I don’t think were expecting STAR to articulate a set of goals. I saw STAR more as a facilitator to all of this and playing a different role in the process than the GITs.
* Scott: I was talking to Bill Dennison about this and found it very useful but it is now apparent STAR has too much of a water quality focus. He thought he would want talk to the MB about what he has learned from the process so far.
* Nita: DFIW will have 2 more conference calls before the August 2nd MB meeting.
* Carl: After the first meeting we will be finalizing the guidance…I hope to get feedback back out quickly so we can decide if we will go forward with the report for the August 2nd MB or not.