**ATTENDANCE:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Carl Hershner | Tim Wilke | Nita Sylvester  |
| Beth Zinecker | Carin Bisland | Doreen Vetter |
| Mike Fritz | Mike Mason | Max Lehner |

 **ACTION ITEMS:**

* Carl will make revisions to “goal discussion guidance” document and send to Carin.
* Carin will ask Nick DiPasquale to provide “goal discussion guidance” document to GIT Chairs and MB members in advance of 8/2/12 MB mtg.
* Carin will send GIT Coordinators/Staffers the revised “goal discussion guidance” document and the revised 3-question slide template for the MB presentations (Slide 1 – Overarching Goal; Slide 2 – Why; Slide 3 – Who).
* Carl will ask Peyton to re-frame his presentation to the MB in the context of the DF.
* Carl will try to get on the agenda of the July 26th STAR meeting to ask for help with next steps in DF.
* Tim will follow-up with Carl related to attendance lists issues and will provide the lists to DFIW in advance of the 7/27/12 mtg.

**SUMMARY**

* Meeting Materials available at mtg webpage: <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/18493/>
* Approved [6/29/12 meeting summary](http://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/18403/dfiw_mtg_summary_062912.docx)
* Discussed comments related to the “goal discussion guidance” document.
	+ Approved addition of “Goals should generally be specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and time-bound.” to the third paragraph.
* Discussed how we continue to advance the work on the DF in the GITs. The next challenge will be development of monitoring metrics and performance expectations, which needs to be moved forward expeditiously.
	+ Agreed that close coordination will be needed between STAR and the DFIW.
	+ Agreed that Carl should ask STAR to become responsible for assisting the GITs with identifying monitoring programs, assessment protocols and indicators.
	+ Also will ask STAR to assist in estimating when we should expect to see changes in the monitoring data and when to expect achievement of water quality standards.
* Discussed 8/2/12 MB presentations.
	+ Agreed that the 3-slide template to be used by the GITs as they develop their goal presentations should focus on What (the overarching goal); Why (e.g. EC commitment or EO outcome); Who (nature of essential partner engagement).
	+ Also agreed that the Harris Creek presentation should be framed in the context of the DF.
* At the next mtg of the DFIW on 7/27/12, the group will discuss any follow-up from the STAR meeting and 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.

**Detailed Minutes:**

* Comments related to the “goal discussion guidance” document:
	+ Scott (provided comments in advance): I think the goal discussion guidance is good overall. The only suggestion I have is to add more criteria of what we think a "clear" goal should be. We had discussed this before so if should not be too hard to add.
	+ Nita (provided comments in advance): I think this doc does a wonderful job of framing the discussion about goal statements and what we are asking of the MB. I also appreciate that it is "Short and Sweet" (increasing the odds that a MB member or GIT Chair will actually read it)!
	+ Greg: incorporate S.M.A.R.T. acronym (specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and time-bound)
	+ Doreen: Carl would you summarize the purpose of the “background info for discussion of CBP goal statement list” document?
	+ Carl: MB wasn’t sure of what all the GITs were up to & latched onto the list of number of goal statements listed.
	+ Carl: I thought the “background info for discussion of CBP goal statement list” would help focus the MB and GIT members to ensure the goal statements are clear and understandable.
	+ Carl: Think in terms of factors that need to be managed to reach the goals.
	+ Carl: Each goal/objective should answer who exactly needs to be engaged?
	+ Carl: This is a replacement guidance document to the original 5 questions document.
	+ Carin: document should go out in 2 phases. Phase 1 – send to GIT chairs first, Phase 2 – send to MB members.
	+ Carin: GIT coordinators met yesterday to discuss the what-why-how 3 slide presentation. They approved the 3 slide format.
	+ DFIW suggested potentially adding a 4th question of who. (what, why, how, who)
	+ Carl: Should Nick DiPasquale send out the documents to the MB? It may be better if the emails originate from him.
	+ Action: Carl will send Carin the revised document version. Carin will follow through with Nick DiPasquale.
* How we continue to advance the work on the DF in the GITs
	+ Carl: We are at a point of the process where energy & enthusiasm can wane. We need to keep it going by continually working with the GITs and clearly outline the next steps.
	+ The big final difficulty is meeting the deadlines & timeline expectations.
	+ Need to engage/transfer responsibility to STAR related to monitoring programs, assessment protocols and indicator development. DFIW needs to coordinate with STAR on this.
	+ Carl will try to get on agenda of July 26th STAR mtg.
	+ DFIW can focus on helping GITs with factors assessment and articulation.
	+ Carin: The water-quality side of the program is being pushed toward adaptive management.
	+ Carin: O’Malley was pushing for on-going constant modeling & monitoring at the EC meeting this year.
	+ STAR needs to get in front of it and try and answer “will we see changes in water quality?” “where will we see the changes?”
* 8/2/12 MB presentations
	+ Carin: At next MB meeting GIT 1 will present their Harris Creek presentation as a case study and example of cross-GIT collaboration.
	+ Carin: The LGAC chair is interested in more regional conferences like Choose Clean Water. Would like to increase the number of such conferences.
	+ The Sustainable Fisheries GIT will go through the decision framework & how Harris Creek has benefited from this.
	+ Fritz: It would be helpful to frame the Harris Creek case study as a microcosm of the larger oyster strategy & as something under the Decision Framework; a tangible example of adaptive management.
	+ Suggestion: we should show how Harris Creek ties in with the larger oyster decision framework on ChesapeakeStat. Perhaps both the presentation and Chesapeake Stat can be displayed simultaneously.
	+ One of the outcomes of the presentation is to setup collaboration with other GITs in areas where it makes sense. It will also help train the GITs, MB, and PSC to use this process in the future for other initiatives.
	+ Nita: Other chairs will present before or after Peyton’s Harris Creek example? Perhaps the first slide can be “factors influencing goals”.
	+ Carin: I hear what you’re saying, but I think goal statements should be displayed on the slide, but not be the main focus of the presentation.
	+ How to talk about “how”? (do it within framework)
	+ Big 3 questions. Where did the goals come from? Who set this goal? How will they be measured?
	+ “How as the coordinating parties?”
	+ Suggestion: Change “How” slide to “Who”. Who can better explain who will be involved and how they will be involved with a particular goal.
	+ Mike Mason: May be able to have Harris Creek set the standard for future GIT updates to the MB.
	+ Action: Carl will call Peyton to work out the frame and order of the Harris Creek presentation.
	+ Decision: The DFIW agreed to a new powerpoint order for the GITs. 1) Slide 1 – Overarching Goal 2) Slide 2 – Why 3) Slide 3 – Who.
	+ Action: Send out the revised 3 question slide to the GITS by COB 7/13/12 along with Carl’s new guidance document.
* The next DFIW meeting will be July 27th (the day after the July 26th STAR meeting).