

# Proposed IRWMP Governance Principles and Structure

## Planning Committee (20-30 members)

- IRWMP decision-making body
- Membership: water agencies, resource agencies, conservation groups, Counties, Tribes, etc. from geographic scope of IRWMP (open to those interested in water resources management)
- Size: unlimited size
- Decision-making: consensus-based with a default for supermajority vote with representation from major interests.
- Meetings open to the public
- Frequency of Meetings: Meet once every other month during Planning Phase and thereafter, meet quarterly.

## Coordinating Committee (8 - 10 members)

- Helps give guidance to IRWMP staff and consultants for managing IRWMP, preparation for meetings, drafting proposed policies, and planning tools
- Membership: representation from major interests and geographic area of IRWMP. Must also be members of Planning Committee.
- Size: Keep this Committee at a small workable number. Suggest 8.
- Frequency of Meetings: Meets every month during Planning stages and every other month thereafter.
- Decision-making: No decision-making authority. Proposes ideas to the Planning Committee for decision-making.
- Meetings are open to other Planning Committee members.

## Fiscal Sponsor (1 entity)

(DWR eligibility: Non-profit or public institution)

- Administration of grants and funds including contracting, reporting, invoicing
- Liability for grants awarded to fiscal sponsor on behalf of the IRWMP
- Leader in region and for IRWMP
- Relationship with DWR

## Regional Authority (3 entities)

(DWR criteria: 3 public agencies, 2 with authority over water.)

- One of three entities will be fiscal sponsor for DWR Planning Grant
- Members of Planning Committee
- Could be members of Coordinating Committee but all don't have to be.
- Decision-making: none, these entities will make consensus decisions as part of the Planning Committee.
- Frequency of meetings: none.

# Proposed IRWMP Governance Principles and Structure

## Governance Principles

- ❖ Decision-making
  - Consensus as primary principle
- ❖ Authority
  - Non-binding, non-regulatory, voluntary collaborative
- ❖ Membership
  - Inclusive, Representative of geographic region and interests, Transparent
- ❖ Low-Hanging Fruit
  - Start with issues we can agree on
- ❖ Prop 50 and Prop 84 Minimum Requirements
  - Regional Management Authority and Fiscal Sponsor

## Decision-Making

1. **Definition of “Consensus”:** In reaching consensus, some Planning Committee members may strongly endorse a particular proposal while others may accept it as "workable." Others may be only able to “live with it.” Still others may choose to “stand aside” by verbally noting a disagreement, yet allowing the group to reach a consensus without them if the decision does not affect them or compromise their interests. Any of these actions still constitutes consensus.
2. **Less than 100% Consensus Decision Making:** The Planning Committee shall not limit itself to strict consensus if 100% agreement among all participants cannot be reached after all interests and options have been thoroughly identified, explored, discussed and considered. Less-than-consensus decision-making shall not be undertaken lightly. If, after full exploration and discussion, the Planning Committee cannot come to 100% agreement, it will use the less-than-consensus decision-making protocols as described below. For proposals or the Plan to be endorsed by the Planning Committee, it must pass the following test. This means that the Plan first has to meet (a).
  - a) **Broad Support of the Planning Committee Membership:** The Plan must be endorsed by a 75% supermajority of the total number of *active* members of the Planning Committee. (In other words, the Plan cannot be opposed by more than 25% of the total number of *active* members of the Planning Committee.)