MEETING REPORT

CALIFORNIA INDIAN CULTURAL CENTER AND MUSEUM
(CALIFORNIA INDIAN HERITAGE CENTER)
TASK FORCE SUB-COMMITTEE ON GOVERNANCE MEETING
February 18, 2004

PUBLIC MEETING

State Resources Building
1416 9th Street, Rm. 905, Pine Room
Sacramento, CA 95814

Task Force Members and Designees present: Gen Denton, Walter Gray, Cindy La Marr, Larry Myers, Charlene Simmons

DPR Staff present: Leo Carpenter, Jr., Paulette Hennum, Cuauhtemoc Gonzalez, Pauline Grenbeaux

CALL MEETING TO ORDER- 10:30 am

DESIGNATION OF CHAIR

Chairwoman La Marr appointed Walter Gray to be Chair of this Sub-Committee. Gray agreed and emphasized that his role would be primarily to serve as a facilitator and to give information so that the rest of the Task Force can decide on what kind of governance they would like to recommend.

INTRODUCTION TO THE ISSUE OF ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

Gray passed out a handout with a summary of the discussion. He stated that the organizational structure needs to be in place for the California Indian Heritage Center to accomplish its goals. He went on to say that this process would take multiple meetings of the Sub-Committee.

> REVIEW OF JANUARY 15, 2004 TASK FORCE MEETING
> Gray reviewed the main points of the January 15th, 2004 discussion starting with the reasons why California State Parks and the California Indian people would want to work together on this project. It came down to the fact that each party needs what the other party has and if the two come together the end result would be of much higher quality. What the California Indians represent is legitimacy and authenticity, and State Parks has resources, and experience in large cultural projects, and collections.
> Task Force members also expressed some of their fears. All said that they had some fears of failure, both personal and professional. The conclusion was the neither the State nor the California Indians could really operate this project on their own. The Task Force can create a new organizational structure to plan, implement, and operate the Heritage Center.

Simmons asked if the amount of private funding for this project is unique.

Gray answered that it was not traditional and that usually the state bears the financial burden. There is a new administration looking for collaborations and the way SB 2063 (Brulte) was written there is a need for collaboration.

> CONTROL VS. INFLUENCE RELATIONSHIPS
>
> Control relationships are those relationships where there is a dominant authority.

> Influence relationships can exist in unlimited amounts. This is because we allow people to influence us. The outcome of an influence relationship is often the same as in a control relationship. This is a high trust relationship. We trust the others' recommendations and then make our choice. High trust, high influence relationships are the most successful. The only problem is that these relationships are not as stable as control relationships.

Myers asked what kind of structures businesses usually fall into.

Gray answered that there are many different types of business behaviors. There is a philosophy of management within each. For example, non-profits are more influence-based as well as small companies. With the more creative structures the enterprise may not be highly commercial. There are always contradictory examples though. High trust relationships are demanding. Those participating have to avoid being exploited and have to question the relationship if there is a constant problem.

Gray mentioned that to help maintain trust in an organization there need to be crisis resolution managers so that any crisis can be handled in a timely manner without harming the organization.

Carpenter commented that the California Indians would like to have a majority of control over the California Indian Heritage Center. Gray said that there would be no problem with that and State Parks could be in charge of the things that it is good at. There are many governance models to look at and take from. The new governance structure for the California Indian Heritage Center will probably be unique within State Parks.

There is still a need for public money so it is important to use a "soft" word like guidance in the Vision Statement and then define it through the structure rather than using a "harder" word. This will allow a greater amount of flexibility.

The consensus of the Task Force is that State Parks should not be in charge because of them not being so credible but at the same time they can be held outside because there is too low a level of influence. Need to develop more trust. There must be accountability.

Could be a free standing non-profit with the same goals as the Heritage Center. There could also be different kinds of contractual relationships.

The next meeting's discussion will include looking at the pros and cons of certain structures. Hypothetical cases studies will be examined to test the goals of the Task Force against them.

Next meeting date is set for Tuesday March 9th 9:30 am- 12:00 pm

ADJOURN- 12:45 PM