



**Governance & Financing Workgroup
Meeting No. 1**

**January 27, 2012 ○ 9:00 am-11:00 am
San Diego County Water Authority
Lobby Conference Room**

Draft Notes

Action items in italics

Attendees:

Mark Stadler, SDCWA	Iovanka Todt, Floodplain Management Association
Cathy Pieroni, City of SD	Michael Drennan, Weston Solutions
Kathleen Flannery, County of SD	Kirk Ammerman, City of Chula Vista
Sheri McPherson, County of SD	Rosalyn Prickett, RMC
Dave Harvey, Rural Community Assistance Corporation	Kathy Caldwell, RMC
Leslie Reynolds, Groundwork San Diego-Chollas Creek	Crystal Mohr, RMC
Anne Van Leer, Land Conservation Brokerage	Lewis Michaelson, Katz & Associates

1. Welcome and Introductions

Lewis Michaelson welcomed the group, who did self-introductions and participated in a brief ice-breaker exercise.

2. IRWM Overview

Rosalyn Prickett provided a brief overview of IRWM planning in the San Diego region to familiarize all attendees with the concept of IRWM planning, the San Diego IRWM Plan Update, and the purpose of the Governance and Finance Workgroup.

3. Workgroup Objectives

Kathy Caldwell provided an overview of the objectives of the Governance and Financing Workgroup, including:

- Examine expansion of funding sources for the San Diego IRWM Program.

- Establish membership guidelines for the RAC, including term limits and the process for replacing a member when his or her term expires, or he or she resigns or needs to be replaced.
- Develop RAC charter, including definition of “consensus” and voting rules.

4. Meeting No. 1 Objectives

Lewis Michaelson provided an overview of the current meeting objectives, including:

- Define “consensus” and decision process for six Workgroups
- Preliminary direction on decision process and membership guidelines for RAC

5. Define “Consensus” and Decision Process for Six Workgroups

- Lewis Michaelson provided a list of draft Ground Rules proposed for all Workgroups. The group discussed the adequacy of the Ground Rules, and ultimately decided that they would be sufficient for the Workgroups associated with the IRWM Plan Update.
- Lewis Michaelson then presented the six potential levels of consensus, and facilitated a discussion regarding levels of consensus and what would occur if a Workgroup reaches an impasse, in that they cannot come to consensus. The group decided that discussions should continue if they are productive in moving towards consensus. If consensus is not possible, then the Workgroup Chair will be responsible for recognizing this and calling for a vote. In the event of a vote, the group decided that a simple majority will be sufficient for moving a decision forward.
- The group discussed the appropriateness of the Ground Rules, consensus, and voting rules for all future Workgroups. The group decided that the Ground Rules, consensus, and voting rules will function as a starting point (baseline) that can be amended in the future if necessary to suit the individual characteristics of a particular Workgroup.
- Next, the group discussed the role of a Workgroup Chair, and decided that Workgroups should have a Chair and a Vice Chair. The purpose of the Vice Chair will be to function as the Chair if the Chair is not present. In addition, the Vice Chair will participate in Workgroup leadership as appropriate. The group decided that it will be beneficial to increase the amount of people with experience and training in working as a Chair, and the Vice Chair position will be a way to build leadership capacity among less experienced stakeholders.
- The group decided that the following would be preferred attributes of Chairs and Vice Chairs:
 - Chair: prior experience as a Chair, and desire to develop new leadership.
 - Vice Chair: desire to increase leadership skills.
 - Mix of functional areas between Chair and Vice Chair.
 - Willing and able to serve.
 - Ability to articulate all interests.
 - Consensus-builder.

- The group then developed the following process for selecting Workgroup Chairs and Vice Chairs:
 1. Determine who is eligible: RAC members and alternates, preferably not RWMG members.
 2. Outline Responsibilities (see below), and provide overview of preferred attributes:
 - Chair: prior experience as a Chair, and desire to develop new leadership.
 - Vice Chair: desire to increase leadership skills.
 - Mix of functional areas between Chair and Vice Chair.
 - Willing and able to serve.
 - Ability to articulate all interests.
 - Consensus-builder.
 3. Take a five (5)-minute break to discuss informally.
 4. Nominate and/or volunteer members to be the Chair and Vice Chair.
 5. Reach consensus and/or vote.
- Next, the group went through the Chair and Vice Chair selection process for the Governance and Financing Workgroup. Kirk Ammerman was selected as the Chair and Iovanka Todt was selected as the Vice Chair. Both positions were selected by consensus of the entire Workgroup.
- Next, the group went over the proposed roles and responsibilities associated with the following Workgroup participants: Workgroup Chair and Vice Chair, Workgroup Members, Planning Study Leads, and Facilitators. The group decided that the following would be responsibilities of Workgroup Members:
 - Attend consistently.
 - Come prepared (review materials).
 - Be responsible to requests in between meetings.
 - Follow the Ground Rules.
 - Represent RAC members within your functional area, and keep them informed.
- The group decided that the established Ground Rules, consensus and voting rules, the Chair selection process (Workgroup Decision Process), and the responsibilities of each Workgroup player would function as a baseline for other Workgroups. For consistency purposes, it would be ideal for all Workgroups to retain the same decision process; however Workgroups have the discretion to change the process as necessary. Planning Study Leads will be responsible for reporting back to the RWMG if any Workgroups decide to alter or deviate from the Baseline Decision Process.
- When the time comes, the group would like to consider additional ground rules that may be appropriate for the Project Selection Workgroups.
- The group decided that if a Facilitator is not present, then responsibilities associated with the Facilitator will be performed by the Chair, Planning Study Lead, or RWMG staff member as appropriate.

6. Workgroup Organization

- See discussion above regarding how the group selected the Chair and Vice Chair, and established meeting rules and procedures.
- The group discussed the Project Schedule, and decided to extend the meeting to three (3) hours, from 9 a.m. to 12 p.m. on April 5, 2012. The meeting will be held at the County Water Authority.

7. Discuss Options for Decision Process for RAC (vs. Current "Knocking" Method)

- The group did not have time to fully discuss the RAC decision-making process, but framed the discussion to prepare for the next Workgroup meeting. The following is a summary of the discussion that took place regarding governance of the RAC:
 - RAC has worked well in the past, so it will continue with the current rules until changes have been made by the Governance & Financing Workgroup.
 - During the next Workgroup meeting, members need to determine if they want to apply the Workgroup Decision Process to the RAC, or develop a separate decision process. The Workgroup will also decide if a formal charter process is necessary for the RAC, and what that charter would contain.
 - The Workgroup also needs to determine if a different Decision Process is necessary for future Workgroups beyond the IRWM Plan Update.
 - The Planning Study Lead will place the RAC decision process issue on the next RAC meeting so the RAC can weigh in on this issue.

8. Discuss Membership Guidelines for the RAC

The group did not reach this agenda item, and will have this discussion at the next Workgroup meeting.

9. Public Comments

No members of the public were present at this Workgroup meeting.

10. Summary and Action Items

Workgroup Chair Kirk Ammerman provided an overview of the achievements and key decisions of the Workgroup and adjourned the meeting.