**ATTENDANCE**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Carl Hershner | Tim Wilke |
| Doreen Vetter | Carin Bisland |
| Beth Zinecker |  |

Meeting materials are available at <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/19079/>

**ACTIONS/DECISIONS/OUTCOMES**

* Action #1: Beth will help develop agenda for future coordinator-staffer meetings. Tim will also create a yearlong plan for future coordinator-staffer agendas. (collaborate with Carl before final)
* Action #2: Tim will distribute long term agenda document and reserve rooms and phone lines for the next year worth of bi-weekly coordinator-staffer meetings.
* Action #3: Carl will keep trying to get in touch with Carl Blankenship regarding Bay Journal articles.
* Action #4: Carin will meet with Peyton about how he can structure his MB meeting presentation to become more decision framework friendly.
* Action #5: Send out MB guidance document to the coordinator-staffer mailing list.
* The next DFIW conf call is scheduled for Friday March 8th.

**DETAILED NOTES**

* Revision to Jon Capacasa comment regarding encouraging innovation at the PSC. (from 1-25-13 DFIW mtg minutes): People want things to be more flexible for adaptive management purposes. Jon Capacasa is considering a more innovative approach for the Bay Program instead of pure adaptive management. With the Water Quality Goal Team we need to guard against the overuse of the term adaptive management so it does not get confused or lose value. We don’t want to over label things that are not truly adaptive management.
* Request to distribute MB guidance document to MB on Monday.
* Carin: I fear the MB guidance discussion could get diluted with focus on options for governance. Also an opportunity to link. I’m open to either option.
* Carin: only real situation where I think you can fit it in well with current planned GIT presentations at the MB is related to GIT 2’s “strategy to accelerate the protection and restoration of SAV in the Chesapeake Bay”
* Carl: MB needs to look for strategies that impact the management of fisheries goals. I think it fits in there. Provide feedback on challenges GIT 1 is having. And Water Quality has many things that need to be thought of for adaptive management. Can easily fit in with GIT 1 Harris Creek follow-up.
* Carl: we are avoiding or delaying a NAS recommendation. It seems like we are muddling along with business as usual.
* Carl: I’ve heard multiple presentations on Harris Creek but I don’t think many of the GITs other than GIT1 fully grasp it and the MB members don’t really get it at all.
* Carl: Guidance was developed over a month ago. We need to move forward. It’s frustrating that progress is so slow. Doesn’t seem to be much interest from GITs.
* Doreen: lost sight and focus on the guidance due to GIT6 full day retreat and emergence of goals & governance options. Need to delegate better as a team if some of us are over-busy.
* Carin: Ball of yarn with lots of different ends to pull. Lots of different ways to approach and solve this. Difficult to figure out which steps to take first and where to gain traction. It’s frustrating but I’ve been struggling with this for a few years now in the program. Difficult to move a lot of moving pieces forward in the same direction at the same time.
* Carl: don’t want it to be a periodic procedure that is implemented. Rather it is a wholescale change of mind, different perspective for all parts of the program on a daily basis – a full paradigm shift. Loss of the philosophical understanding by the list of details needed to accomplish this…been bogged down in the weeds.
* Carl: that’s why we need guidance on “here is how to look at things…here’s a new way to view and think about it”
* Carin: Greg B. is responsible for MB agenda, and so is Lauren T. They are the ones who influence how the agenda is written. Carin will be sure that they understand that we want a consistent agenda organization that helps facilitate this type of adaptive thinking….need to make sure the 2 of them get what we are trying to do.
* Idea: get buy in from GIT chairs with Carl and DFIW crew…..coordinators and staffers are starting to get it…still not completely but slowly…chairs and vice chair level however is very much in the dark on this. Need to sell it with real examples…try a new approach
* Take manageable chunks of the framework and break it down with a hypothetical example at coordinator staffer meetings. (example GIT1 example of future oyster project work with Corp of engineers well ahead of implementation time for a project to identify any collaborative opportunities) so if DFIW presents a hypothetical example it may help increase buy-in.
* Talk about “what are you finding within your framework” instead of at broad level of what they need to do.
* Don’t count on final product for each GIT. Need to get past bay program mindset of everyone needs to approve everything. Most important thing is the logic sinks in all of their heads that force others to think though what they are deciding to work on.
* Use Carl’s GIT6 example saying “how decision framework should work in your own GIT”.