**ATTENDANCE:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Carl Hershner | Tim Wilke | Nita Sylvester |
| Beth Zinecker | Darrell Brown | Greg Allen |
| Anna Stuart Burnett | Peter Tango |  |

**ACTION ITEMS**

* Tim Wilke will identify the actual agencies/jurisdictions represented at each of the MB and PSC historical meetings based on the attendance document shared at today’s meeting. Identify the 2-3 persons from each delegation that most frequently attend.
* Greg Allen and Tim Wilke will bring a report on the agency representation at past meetings by the August 7th GIT6 meeting.
* Tim will complete by August 24th DFIW meeting a detailed report of who is fulfilling the jurisdiction/agency attendance.
* Tim will contact Greg Barranco and inform him it was difficult to recreate historical attending record. Perhaps establish a new staffer protocol for MB attendance?
* DFIW will review the “who’s filling the member organizations role/attendance” report at the August 24th meeting.

**SUMMARY**

* Meeting Materials available at mtg webpage: <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/18494/>
* Approved [7/13/12 meeting summary](http://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/18493/dfiw_mtg_summary_071312.docx)
* Discussed attendance at the MB and PSC mtgs over the past year and a half to see if it can help pinpoint inefficiencies in the decision making process.
* Discussed follow-up from the 7/26/12 STAR Business mtg related to a process that involves STAR in the decision framework and a discussion with the GITs at a combined STAR/Coordinators/Staffers mtg on Aug 23, 2012.
* The next DFIW meeting will be August 10th.

**DETAILED MINUTES**

***Historical MB/PSC Attendance Conversation:***

* Carl asked Tim to
  + Identify what attendance was supposed to be
  + Identify what actually occurred
  + Identify dual MB-PSC members or attendees (and identify how they fulfilled their roles)
* Tim sent the analysis to the DFIW in advance of today’s mtg (refer to [MB-PSC Attendance](http://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/18494/mb-psc_attendance_7.25.xlsx) and [MB-PSC Attendance Duplicates](http://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/18494/attendance_duplicates.docx))
* Greg sent a memo to the DFIW in advance of today’s mtg to look at the [MB governance document](http://www.chesapeakebay.net/channel_files/18494/mb_governance_document.docx) at the same time. “Since we are doing some assessment of MB operations, I thought you might want to see what the governance document says about the MB. Ultimately, decisions on changes to membership and operations should be captured in the next revision of the document.”
* The analysis of historical meeting attendance all ties in with revisiting the governance document and the workflow/decision making models in the Bay Program.
* When reviewing the governance document: see who is the individual representing each jurisdiction/agency/group at the MB/PSC meetings, and determine if it is always the same person. Try to analyze of every decision that is currently being sent to MB/PSC needs to do so. Potentially rethink the decision making process, and finally determine how efficiently the delegates from each jurisdiction/agency relay the information to their group
* Tim: I found the historic attendance records incomplete, and hard to track down. We currently do not publically distribute MB attendance. Perhaps this is something that can be brought to the MB chair? Should be distribute attendance after all future MB meetings?
* **Action: Tim will contact Greg Barranco and inform him it was difficult to recreate historical attending record. Perhaps establish a new staffer protocol for MB attendance?**
* **Action: Tim Wilke will identify the actual agencies/jurisdictions represented at each of the historical meetings based on the attendance document shared at today’s meeting. Identify the 2-3 person from each delegation that most frequently attend.**
* Darrell: Looking at the past attendance document I’m shocked that at one point or another we have had so many different person involved in the MB or PSC meetings. It seems inefficient to retrain so many persons.
* Carl: Greg Allen & GIT6 should take ownership of this initiative.
* Greg Allen: Any changes we decide based on the findings need to go into a revised governance document. This also needs to occur as a two-way exchange with the MB and PSC.
* **Action: Greg Allen + Tim Wilke will bring a report on the agency representation at past meetings by the August 7th GIT6 meeting.**
* **Action: DFIW will review the “who’s filling the member organizations role/attendance” report at the August 24th meeting.**
* **Action: Tim will complete by August 24th DFIW meeting a detailed report of who is fulfilling the jurisdiction/agency attendance.**

***STAR Conversation:***

* STAR leadership agreed to request from Carl and will reinforce decision framework principles (related to "Developing a Monitoring Program" and "Assessing Performance") in the following 3 ways:
  + Peter Tango/Mark Bennett/Bill Dennison to be asking for time on agenda at Aug 23rd Coordinator/Staffer mtg.
  + Peter/Nita to insert themselves into the Goals discussion at Aug 9th joint mtg of STAR’s IWG and the Coordinator/Staffer Group
  + DFIW GIT mentor involvement in STAR Action Teams. Here's the memo Nita sent to Peter Tango:
    - Peter, As follow-up to our discussions today about STAR "action teams" and reinforcing the decision framework questions Carl posed related to Developing a Monitoring Program and Assessing Performance (e.g. "what do you want to track" and "what are your expectations for a response"), here is the list of GIT mentors from the Decision Framework Implementation Workgroup. If the GIT they mentor is participating in a STAR action team, you may want to include the DFIW mentors on the team to help reinforce the DF questions.
      * Fisheries GIT: Brent McCloskey and Carin Bisland
      * Habitat GIT: Doreen Vetter
      * Water Quality GIT: Scott Phillips and Greg Allen
      * Watersheds GIT: Mike Fritz and Anna Stuart
      * Stewardship GIT: Mike Mason
* Nita: August 9th coordinator/staffer meeting with STAR’s IWG will help further these discussions. For one agenda item, Mike Land has asked the group to look @ the preliminary GIT goals document and discuss how we are planning to track goal/outcome achievement:
  + Which need to be tracked publicly on ChesapeakeBay.net?
  + How (e.g via indicators or other means)?
  + Are there gaps in our ability to track goals?
  + Are there gaps in the goals?
* Carl: The Management Board needs to express how they will be involved w/ tracking and developing goals.
* Carl has spoken with Nick, and there have been lots of trading discussion occurring in smaller meetings; particularly with the advisory committees.
* Darrel: EPAs trading team has been involved. Jon Capacasa, etc. They will work with the Trading & Offsets Workgroup.
* Darrel: Is there wiggle room in the Decision Framework model between the different GITs? Can they be at different stages?
* Carl: Yes but I want to keep pressing the urgency to the GITs, to ensure everyone stays on track. The urgency has had positive benefits so far. All the current goals must be plugged through the Decision Framework by the end of 2012.