Meeting purpose: To update the “rules of the road” for the Collaborative and its members in order to build power, movement, and a united front - while also respecting the right for individual DDDC members to engage in activities that, at times, might be in conflict with Collaborative work.

Summary: The DDD members at the meeting co-created and agreed to respect 19 DDD rules of the road. A list of meeting participants is included in this report.

The 19 rules of the road are listed in the table below and should be shared with all members active in DDD.

To stay on track moving forward, DDD should pay attention to (from the feedback forms filled out at the end of the meeting):

- Implementation and following through on next steps for the 19 rules of the road agreed today
- Clear communication of decisions and implementation protocols
- The spirit with which we move forward, to build stronger relationships (don’t want to go too far into a bureaucratic/judicial/restrictive tone for our collaboration).
- Individual participation and mindfulness. Being present and respectful to the process
- Making sure people live up to the commitments they make
- DDD’s past work in the policy manual and core beliefs document

Satisfaction reported with progress made in the meeting to strengthen DDD relationships and functioning: Average score a 4 on a scale from 0-5 (3 = satisfied and 5 = far exceeded expectations).

Consultant next steps recommendations:

1. The Steering Committee can ensure follow-through by addressing the practicalities of how to operationalize the work done on December 5 at their next meeting (see the middle column of the chart below).
2. Orient and agree with the new staff person how she, in her role as Coordinator, can and will support operational consistency and follow through.
3. In early 2012, DDD can usefully convene an all-member meeting for planning the year ahead which would meet the needs of several implementation ideas at the same time. At that meeting look at member DDD-specific work plans, capacity and budget. Also share individual or organization 2012 work and where there is overlap with DDD work.
and potential tensions as well as how members will navigate to respect the relationship between their organization and DDD by applying an existing rules of the road or improvising one for the situation.

4. The Steering Committee can consider if/when additional external facilitation would be useful to DDD as the collaborative integrates the rules of the road to operate more effectively. External facilitation might be useful for the all-member meeting recommended for early 2012.

### DDD Rules of the Road – Co-Created by Members on December 5, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The rule that was agreed</th>
<th>To operationalize – what DDD will do [differently] in 2012.</th>
<th>Notes to clarify intent and follow up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>THE MOST PRIMARY RULES OF ENGAGEMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. DDD decisions do not dictate individual organization policies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Individual organization policies do not dictate DDD policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXTERNAL COMMUNICATION</strong></td>
<td>Create an annual calendar of meetings and make sure our meeting process works well and implements our rules of the road. Think about having Steering Committee meetings before full member meetings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules clarifying who can speak for DDD and what can they say.</td>
<td>Create an annual external communication plan/program so DDD has a general picture of where its work, positions and messages will be promoted and by whom.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. DDD will create an annual platform of pre-approved:</td>
<td>Need to create an annual process and timeline for reviewing and approving the annual platform.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mission, vision and core beliefs (revisiting them)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DDD external advocacy policies,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• and internal operating protocols.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The annual DDD platform will be communicated to all “active” members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and staff/coordinators to inform them on what they can communicate as DDD’s official positions in external policy advocacy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. <strong>Staff/Coordinators must be directed by committee to speak on behalf of DDD (at public meetings, conferences, letters, etc.).</strong></th>
<th>The SC needs to give staff/coordinators clear direction on the authorization they have to represent DDD. Specify the leeway staff has to pro-actively promote DDD’s agenda in the various public venues they will be in. Create regular communication mechanisms for staff to pro-actively inform DDD in advance when they plan to speak on behalf of DDD.</th>
<th>DDD wants to give staff leeway to advocate on positions DDD has taken in a range of settings including promotional speaking at conferences. The spirit is not to restrict the ability to advocate for DDD and our work. The spirit we want is respect. If a person knows in advance of a public venue where they can represent DDD and our work they should let DDD know in advance.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>Members must have committee approval to speak on behalf of DDD (at public meetings, conferences, letters, etc.).</strong></td>
<td>Create regular communication mechanisms for members to pro-actively inform DDD in advance when they have an opportunity to speak on behalf of DDD.</td>
<td>DDD wants to give members leeway to advocate on positions DDD has taken in a range of settings including planned speaking engagements and impromptu opportunities. The spirit is not to restrict the ability to advocate for DDD and our work. The spirit we want is respect. If a person knows in advance of a public venue where they can represent DDD and our work they should let DDD know in advance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <strong>Staff/Coordinators and Members will be clear when speaking in public venues if they are personally commenting on an issue. They will be careful to attribute their comments as personal opinion and</strong></td>
<td>Create and share recommended language for all Staff/Coordinators and Members to use when expressing a personal opinion that does not reflect a position of DDD.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DECISION MAKING</strong></td>
<td>Clarity role of Steering Committee and role of community groups. Relates to where power lies (raised by Margaret – more clarification of what she sees is needed would be helpful). Also relates to who sets the agenda given that there are many different types of players at the table.</td>
<td>Note: DDD can take new information under advisement without necessarily having to revisit past decisions. Constantly revisiting decisions is chaotic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Reaffirm DDD’s consensus decision making process.</td>
<td>Pull up DDD’s consensus decision making process and share it with members. Confirm agreement to use this process.</td>
<td>Want all members to be on the same page about how DDD defines consensus decision making. Want to be able to raise and discuss concerns and different points and argue in a productive way. DDD’s definition of consensus does not mean 100% unanimity (there is an option to “stand aside”).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 8. Members will respect DDD’s decisions. | Document the decisions members are expected to respect.  
- Today’s rules of the road  
- Member’s manual |  |
| 9. Steering Committee decisions will be communicated clearly to active members.  
Major decisions will be separated from general SC meeting notes and highlighted in a brief easy to digest format (the longer rationale behind the decision can be in a longer appendix). | SC will establish a communications procedures for having major decisions summarized in brief and shared with all members. |  |
| 10. Active members may appeal/revisit a Steering Committee decision, but | Create a mechanism for appealing/revisiting a decision |  |
must ultimately respect the final outcome. (consultant recommends creating a form that an appellant would fill out. The form should specify what the decision currently is, the substantive issue is that is new that DDD should consider, the proposed change in the decision from the appellant)

11. Decisions will only be revisited if there is a substantially different consideration that has not previously been discussed. Create a working definition of what constitutes a substantially different concern that warrants revisiting a past decision. Apply the working definition to determine whether to put a revisiting decision on an agenda. Purpose is to prevent the tendency to repeat discussions that have already taken place. DDD members will need to check ourselves and others on whether a decision truly warrants revisiting.

12. Revisiting decisions will be treated as a formal agenda item. Put any decisions to be revisited on agendas as a separate agenda item that is submitted in advance of the meeting).

13. Whenever revisiting a decision, DDD will include a recap of how we arrived at the decision. Prepare a recap of how decisions were arrived at whenever there is a revisiting decision agenda item. Purpose is to prevent the tendency to repeat discussions that have already taken place.

14. New organizations joining DDD need to respect DDD’s past decisions. Make this clear to organizations interested in joining DDD. Share DDD’s current platform with those interested in joining DDD so they are aware of what they are agreeing to. Purpose is to be clear that DDD will not revisit past decisions to cater to the issues of a new member organization. New members should accept DDD’s position as a condition of joining.

**MEMBER ACCOUNTABILITY & DECISION MAKING PRIVILEGES**

15. Clarify different DDD membership categories. Distinguish members who are active from the larger listserv general membership. Pull up DDD’s existing definition for active membership that was used to determine stipend eligibility (had to attend X out of the last Y meetings). Update/refine the active membership. Need to quantify active membership (e.g., attended X out of the last Y meetings). DDD already has some a definition of what constitutes active membership.
Generally want membership categories to provide a balance of continuity in participation and flexibility. Consistency of participation is necessary to have the privilege of revisiting decisions and getting stipends to do work. This consistency = active membership.

The active members will be kept informed of all DDD decisions.

DDD wants to keep the broader listserv informed in a meaningful way (they do not need to be included on all internal decisions at the same level as the active membership).

| 16. DDD will check-in annually on individual member organization’s capacity and budget and DDD related work plan. | Create a process for the annual check-in. Consultant recommends doing it in the 1st quarter of 2012. Purpose is to create a clear and transparent way of operating and to hold groups and individuals accountable for work they commit to (especially when groups/individuals are being funded to move DDD work forward). |  |

| **CONFLICT RESOLUTION** |  |

| 17. DDD members will communicate pro-actively around potentially contentious issues. | Consultant recommendation: Create a statement of aspiration and intent for the spirit and culture DDD wants to foster related to conflict resolution. DDD’s current culture for handling conflict needs further developing to be effective in conflict situations. |  |

| 18. When there is conflict between individual member organizations that is not related to DDD business/positions, then resolution |  |
of that conflict is not an agenda item for DDD (and the groups should work out the conflict directly between them outside of DDD). | Create a mechanism for conflict resolution to be put on an agenda when necessary.

| 19. If there is conflict for one or more membership organizations related to DDD business/positions then conflict resolution will be a formal agenda item on the working committee or steering committee agenda. |

---

**Participants in the December 6, 2011 meeting**

All DDDC members invited.

**Attended:**
1. Brian Beveridge, West Oakland Environmental Indicators Project
2. Catalina Garzon, Pacific Institute
3. Christine Cordero, Center for Environmental Health
4. Frank Gallo, San Leandro resident
5. Joel Ervice, Regional Asthma Management and Prevention
6. Karen Pierce, Bay View/Hunter’s Point Community Advocates; San Francisco Department of Public Health
7. Margaret Gordon, West Oakland Environmental Indicators Project (attended portions of the meeting by phone)
8. Michael Kent, Contra Costa County Health Services
9. Paul Cummings, Alameda County Department of Public Health
10. Richard Grow, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
11. Angela Angel, DDD Coordinator

**Members not represented:**
1. Diane Bailey, Natural Resources Defense Council
2. Nehanda Imara, Communities for a Better Environment
3. Scott Kessler, California Breathing, California Department of Public Health
4. Wafaa Aborashed, Healthy 880 Communities
5. Azibuike Akaba, Regional Asthma Management and Prevention
6. Eli Moore, Pacific Institute
7. Mona Mena, Alameda County Department of Public Health

Note: Margaret Gordon was participating by phone and at times was not present on the call. She was not present to indicate her buy-in on rules #3, 4, 5, 12, 18 and 19