

SEWERAGE & WATER BOARD OF NEW ORLEANS
GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE MEETING
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 2015

2:15 PM

Kerri Kane, Chair • Alan Arnold, Vice Chair • Kimberly Thomas • Marion Bracy • Robin Barnes

FINAL AGENDA

ACTION ITEMS

1. Cooperative Endeavor Agreement between the Sewerage & Water Board of New Orleans and the City of New Orleans and Deltares USA, Inc. (R-219-2015)

PRESENTATION ITEMS

2. Board Self-Assessment
3. Strategic Plan Update 2016-2025

INFORMATION ITEMS

4. Review of Previous Report
5. Any Other Matters



SEWERAGE AND WATER BOARD

Inter-Office Memorandum

Date: November 12, 2015

To: Cedric S. Grant, Executive Director

From: Ann Wilson, Chief Environmental Affairs *AW*

Re: Cooperative Endeavor Agreement between the Sewerage and Water Board of New Orleans and the City of New Orleans and Deltares USA, Inc.

Sewerage and Water Board of New Orleans, City of New Orleans and Deltares USA, Inc. intend to prepare and execute cooperative endeavor agreement that will enable the parties to implement the objectives outlined in the Agreement to improve the City's drainage infrastructure by developing a collaboration to deliver urban land and water management solutions.

APPROVAL FOR COOPERATIVE ENDEAVOR AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE SEWERAGE AND WATER BOARD OF NEW ORLEANS AND THE CITY OF NEW ORLEANS AND DELATRES USA, INC.

WHEREAS, the Sewerage and Water Board of New Orleans (the Board) desires to accomplish the valuable public purpose of improving the City's drainage infrastructure by developing a collaboration with the City of New Orleans (the City) to deliver urban land and water management solutions;

WHEREAS, the Board and the City thus seek to partner with an organization that can provide high expertise on urban water planning, design and management to improve water quality, to reduce the risk of flooding and land subsidence, and to address groundwater and stormwater as critical factors in shaping a safer, more liveable, and economically vibrant region;

WHEREAS, Deltares USA, Inc. is an organization that provides a high standard of expertise and advice in the field of urban land and water management, and that works closely with local governments; and

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Sewerage and Water Board of New Orleans hereby agrees to prepare and execute the Cooperative Endeavor Agreement (Agreement) with the City of New Orleans and Deltares USA, Inc. that will enable the implementation of the objectives of this Agreement, and particularly the actions and activities; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Executive Director is hereby authorized to execute, on behalf of the Sewerage and Water Board of New Orleans, the Agreement between the Board, City and Deltares USA, Inc.

I, Cedric S. Grant, Executive Director,
Sewerage and Water Board of New Orleans, do hereby
certify that the above and foregoing is a true and
correct copy of a Resolution adopted at the Regular
Monthly Meeting of said Board, duly called and held,
according to law, on November 18, 2015.

CEDRIC S. GRANT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
SEWERAGE AND WATER BOARD OF NEW ORLEANS

COOPERATIVE ENDEAVOR AGREEMENT
BETWEEN
THE SEWERAGE AND WATER BOARD OF NEW ORLEANS
AND
THE CITY OF NEW ORLEANS
AND
DELTAES USA, INC.

THIS COOPERATIVE ENDEAVOR AGREEMENT (the “**Agreement**”) is made and entered into on this _____ day of _____, 2015 (the “**Effective Date**”), by and between the Sewerage and Water Board of New Orleans, represented by Cedric S. Grant, Executive Director (the “**SWBNO**”), the City of New Orleans, represented by Mitchell J. Landrieu, Mayor (the “**City**”), and Deltaes USA, Inc., represented by Dr. Toon Segeren, President of Deltaes USA (“**Deltaes USA**”), sometimes collectively referred to as the “**Parties**.”

WHEREAS, the City is a political subdivision organized under the law of the State of Louisiana;

WHEREAS, SWBNO is a political corporation organized under the laws of the State of Louisiana;

WHEREAS, Deltaes USA is non-profit organization, organized under the laws of the State of Maryland;

WHEREAS, pursuant to Article 7, Section 14(C) of the Louisiana Constitution of 1974, and related statutes, and more specifically for the City, under Section 9-314 of the Home Rule Charter of the City of New Orleans, the SWBNO and the City may enter into cooperative endeavors with the State of Louisiana, its political subdivisions and corporations, the United States and its agencies, and any public or private corporation, association, or individual with regard to cooperative financing and other economic development activities, the procurement and development of immovable property, joint planning and implementation of public works, the joint use of facilities, joint research and program implementation activities, joint funding initiatives, and other similar activities in support of public education, community development, housing rehabilitation, economic growth, and other public purposes;

WHEREAS, SWBNO and the City are committed to improve the City’s drainage system by employing grey and green infrastructure approaches;

WHEREAS, in 2014, SWBNO developed a “Green Infrastructure Plan” to explore and pursue inclusion of green infrastructure;

WHEREAS, in accordance with its plan, SWBNO seeks to identify and select projects that are economically, environmentally, and socially impactful for the City, its communities and the region;

WHEREAS, the City is applying for a portion of the funding being made available by

the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development through this National Disaster Resilience Competition (“NDRC”) grant to address remaining damage from Hurricane Isaac in 2012 and to undertake projects and programs that will enhance our resilience into the future;

WHEREAS, SWBNO and the City thus seek to partner with an organization that can provide high expertise on urban water planning, design and management to improve water quality, to reduce the risk of flooding and land subsidence, and to address groundwater and stormwater as critical factors in shaping a safer, more livable, and economically vibrant region;

WHEREAS, Deltares USA is an organization that provides a high standard of expertise training and advice in the field of urban land and water management, and that works closely with local governments; and

WHEREAS, the Parties desire to accomplish the valuable public purpose of improving the City’s drainage infrastructure by developing a collaboration to deliver urban land and water management solutions.

NOW THEREFORE, the Parties, each having the authority to do so, agree as follows:

ARTICLE I – OBJECTIVES OF THIS AGREEMENT

The Parties agree that the objectives will be as follows:

1. Enhance the present cooperation between SWBNO, the City, and Deltares USA at operational, research and staff level;
2. Utilize the expertise of Deltares USA in the field of urban land & water management, urban planning, collaborative planning, groundwater management, land subsidence control and related specialist fields for SWBNO;
3. Identify the need for new approaches, models and tools; jointly try to retrieve funding for such new development;
4. Share relevant data, research results and insights on a mutually agreed basis;
5. Explore regional communication opportunities so that the partnership’s work in New Orleans is an example of how to create a resilient city; and
6. Enhance the present cooperation between SWBNO, the City, and Deltares USA at operational, research and staff level.

ARTICLE II - IMPLEMENTATION OF OBJECTIVES

A. The Parties agree to prepare and to execute cooperative endeavor agreement(s) that will enable the implementation of the objectives of this Agreement, and particularly the actions and activities described under an annual work plan.

B. The Parties will each designate a representative for the implementation and facilitation of this Agreement (the “**Designated Representatives**”). The Designated Representatives will be responsible for the following:

1. Draw up an action list for implementation of the objectives as described under Article I;

2. Facilitate communication between the various departments and individuals within SWBNO, the City, and Deltares USA, at management and professional level;
 3. Enable the sharing of data, information, research and insights conditioned upon the appropriate confidentiality provisions to respect any intellectual property rights that may be applicable and to the extent permitted by any applicable laws;
 4. Follow-up on any implementation issues that may arise between and/or among the Parties;
 5. Inform and engage the Parties' senior management on an annual basis and as required for the implementation of the Agreement;
 6. Communicate and educate local and regional communities on various projects of SWBNO, the City, and Deltares USA; and
 7. Ensure that each party's obligations and actions arising from this Agreement are carried out.
- C. SWBNO, the City, and Deltares USA will meet and review on an annual basis to develop and agree to an annual work plan for the following year (the "**Annual Work Plan**"). The Annual Work Plan is considered as an integral part of this Agreement. The first Annual Work Plan is made a part of this Agreement and is attached as Appendix 1;

ARTICLE III - DURATION

This Agreement shall commence on the Effective Date and shall continue for a period of one (1) year from that date.

ARTICLE IV - EXTENSION

SWBNO and the City may extend the term this Agreement for up to (5) successive one (1) year periods provided upon the combined approval from the City Council and the SWBNO's Board of Directors.

ARTICLE V – TERMINATION FOR CONVENIENCE

Either party may terminate this Agreement at any time during the term of the Agreement by giving the other party written notice of its intention to terminate at least thirty (30) days before the intended date of termination.

ARTICLE VI - NOTICE

Any notice, demand, communication or request required or permitted hereunder shall be in writing and delivered in person or by certified mail, return receipt requested as follows:

Dr. Toon Segeren
Delta USA, Inc.
8070 Georgia Avenue, Suite 303
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910

and

Cedric S. Grant, Executive Director
Sewerage and Water Board of New Orleans
625 St. Joseph Street, Room 233
New Orleans, Louisiana 70165

and

Mayor's Office
City of New Orleans
1300 Perdido Street, 2nd floor
New Orleans, LA 70112

and

Copy to:

City Attorney
City of New Orleans
1300 Perdido Street, Suite 5E03
New Orleans, LA 70112

Notices shall be effective when received by each of the above-referenced individuals at the addresses specified above. Each party shall be responsible for notifying the other in writing that references this Agreement of any changes in the respective addresses set forth above.

ARTICLE VII - DISPUTES

Any disputes which may arise from the implementation of this Agreement will be addressed by the Designated Representatives. The Designated Representatives may call on the Parties for the resolution of any conflict, should the need arise.

ARTICLE VIII - JURISDICTION

The Parties yield to the jurisdiction of the State Civil Courts of the Parish of Orleans and formally waive any pleas of jurisdiction on account of the residence elsewhere.

ARTICLE IX - GOVERNING LAW

This Agreement will be construed and enforced in accordance with the laws of the State of Louisiana.

ARTICLE X – MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

A. Acknowledgment of Exclusion of Worker's Compensation Coverage. Deltares USA expressly agrees and acknowledges that it is an independent contractor as defined in La. R.S. 23:1021 and as such, it is expressly agreed and understood between the Parties, in entering into this Agreement, that the City shall not be liable to Deltares USA for any benefits or coverage as provided by the Workmen's Compensation Law of the State of Louisiana, and further, under the provisions of La. R.S. 23:1034, anyone employed by Deltares USA shall not be considered an employee of the City for the purpose of Workers' Compensation coverage.

B. Acknowledgment of Exclusion of Unemployment Compensation Coverage. Deltares USA herein expressly declares and acknowledges that it is an independent contractor, and as such is being hired by the City under this Agreement for hire as noted and defined in La. R.S. 23:1472(E), and therefore, it is expressly declared and understood between the Parties, in entering into this services agreement, or agreement for hire, and in connection with unemployment compensation only, that:

1. Deltares USA has been and will be free from any control or direction by the City over the performance of the objectives covered by this Agreement; and
2. Objectives to be performed by Deltares USA are outside the normal course and scope of the City's usual business; and
3. Deltares USA has been independently engaged in performing the objectives listed herein prior to the date of this Agreement.

Consequently, neither Deltares USA nor anyone employed by Deltares USA shall be considered an employee of the City for the purpose of unemployment compensation coverage, which is expressly waived and excluded.

C. Waiver of Benefits. The City and Deltares USA agree and understand that Deltares USA, acting as an independent agent, shall not receive any sick and annual leave, health or life insurance, pension, or other benefits from the City.

D. No Third-Party Beneficiaries. This Agreement is entered into for the exclusive benefit of the Parties, and the Parties expressly disclaim any intent to benefit any person that is not a party to this Agreement.

E. Agreement Binding. This Agreement is not assignable by either party unless authorized by a validly executed amendment.

F. Modifications. This Agreement shall not be modified except by written amendment executed by authorized representatives of the Parties.

G. Voluntary Execution. The Parties have read and fully understand the terms, covenants and conditions set forth in this Agreement and is executing the same willingly and voluntarily of its own volition.

H. Complete Agreement. This Agreement supersedes and replaces any and all prior agreements, negotiations, and discussions between the Parties with regard to the terms, obligations, and conditions of this Agreement.

[The remainder of this page is intentionally left blank]

[PARTIES SIGNATURES CONTAINED ON NEXT THREE PAGES]

CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

BY: _____
MITCHELL J. LANDRIEU, MAYOR

**APPROVED AS TO FORM AND LEGALITY:
LAW DEPARTMENT**

By: _____

[BOARD SIGNATURE CONTAINED ON NEXT PAGE]

SEWERAGE AND WATER BOARD OF NEW ORLEANS

BY: _____
CEDRIC S. GRANT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Legal Department

By: _____

[DELTARES USA SIGNATURE CONTAINED ON NEXT PAGE]

DELTA USA, INC.

BY: _____
DR. TOON SEGEREN, PRESIDENT

[APPENDIX 1 CONTAINED ON NEXT PAGE]

**APPENDIX 1 TO THE COOPERATIVE ENDEAVOR AGREEMENT
BETWEEN
THE SEWERAGE AND WATER BOARD OF NEW ORLEANS
AND
THE CITY OF NEW ORLEANS
AND
DELTAES USA, INC.**

ANNUAL WORK PLAN (2015 – 2016)

In the table below, the agreed actions and activities are detailed for the period from the 1st of November 2015 until the 30th of September 2016. The table includes a short description of the action, the name of the activity leader, if appropriate, and any further agreement on the implementation of the action. As outlined in the Agreement, the operational responsibility for the implementation of the Annual Work Plan lies with the representatives of the Parties.

No	Action	Lead persons	Time frame
1	Development of the Adaptation Support Tool for New Orleans	Frans van der Ven (Deltares) Melinda Nelson (SWBNO) Prisca Weems (CNO)	11/15-01/16
2	Development of a regional groundwater monitoring system and subsidence-reduction strategy	Roelof Stuurman (Deltares) Scott Finney (SWBNO) Prisca Weems (CNO) Mead Allison (TWIG) Alex Kolker (Tulane)	11/15-06/16
3	Operational research on applicability of new sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) and best management practices (BMP's) for rainwater harvesting and stormwater treatment in New Orleans	Frans van der Ven (Deltares) Brad Klamer (SWBNO) Prisca Weems (CNO)	01/16-08/16
4	Real-time control of urban water management system (pumps, gates) using weather (especially rainfall) forecasting to support optimal anticipating water management in New Orleans. Feasibility, operational research, knowledge exchange.	Frans van de Ven (Deltares) Karel Heijnert (Deltares USA) Joe Becker (NOLA) Katelyn Constanza (TWIG)	01/16-09/16

[END OF AGREEMENT]

SEWERAGE & WATER BOARD OF NEW ORLEANS

BOARD SELF - ASSESSMENT TOOL



Overview

The Sewerage & Water Board of New Orleans Board Self-Assessment Tool is designed to help the Board of Director's assess performance and identify priorities for board activities going forward. This tool has been adopted from the *McKinsey & Company Nonprofit Board Self-Assessment Tool – Long Form*. It should be used with *The Dynamic Board: Lesson from High Performing Nonprofits* framework for nonprofit board responsibilities, which describes in detail the key elements of effective nonprofit board governance. The output of the assessment is intended to focus discussion among board members to:

- To identify the areas of board performance that are strongest and those that need improvement
- To identify priority areas for the board to focus on over the next 1 - 2 years
- To allow different views to emerge and used to start a discussion

This tool is meant to create an informed starting point for discussion among the Board to address priorities which will result in board effectiveness. A board committee, rather than the entire Board, can often handle specific responsibilities and bring topics forward for full board discussion as needed. Respondents should use their best judgment to rate the Board's performance. The scores are meant to provide a general indication of the Board's performance in order to identify potential areas for improvement. Please make generous use of the comments section to expand on your ratings.

Guidelines for Assessors

The Nonprofit Board Self-Assessment Tool has three sections:

1. Performance of the Board (or board committee) on its core responsibilities
2. Perceived importance of responsibilities for the next 1-2 years
3. Quality of enablers in place to support board effectiveness

In Sections 1 and 3, mark the box in each row that is closest to describing the situation at hand and use the comments section to expand on any aspect of performance, if necessary. For each of the responsibilities in Section 2, indicate how important you believe it will be for the Board to focus on each area in order to make the most positive impact on the performance of the organization. These ratings are intended to indicate relative priorities for each responsibility. Please return your completed tool to the Executive Director who will collect the results and compile an anonymous summary of comments for board discussion.

Approximate time needed for completion: 30 minutes

SECTION 1: PERFORMANCE OF BOARD ON ITS CORE RESPONSIBILITIES

Size and Structure	Poor (1)	Average (2)	Good (3)	Distinctive (4)	Comments:
Common understanding of mission	<input type="checkbox"/> Active and open Disagreement about mission	<input type="checkbox"/> Board members appear to share surface understanding of mission; disagreements may exist at deeper level although they have not been raised	<input type="checkbox"/> Board members share common understanding of mission although it has not been stressed tested through discussion	<input type="checkbox"/> All board members share a common understanding of the mission that has been stress tested through discussion	
Common understanding of vision (i.e., what the organization aspires to become in 5 years)	<input type="checkbox"/> Board members lack understanding of vision is distinct from mission	<input type="checkbox"/> Vision not formalized; board members' understanding of vision not aligned with likely disagreement over what is achievable	<input type="checkbox"/> Board members appear to have a common understanding of the vision; vision not documented and/or lacks concrete goals	<input type="checkbox"/> All board members share common understanding of where organization wants to be in 5-10 years; vision is well documented with concrete goals	
Use of mission and vision in policy/strategy decisions	<input type="checkbox"/> Board members do not refer to mission and vision in their discussions on policy/strategy	<input type="checkbox"/> Board members infrequently refer to mission and vision in discussions on policy/strategy	<input type="checkbox"/> Although not formalized, board members frequently refer to mission and vision in discussions on policy/strategy	<input type="checkbox"/> All major policy/strategy discussions include explicit consideration of fit with mission and vision	
Process for raising mission and vision issues	<input type="checkbox"/> Board has no formal process to engage board in reviewing the mission and vision	<input type="checkbox"/> Informal discussion within small groups on mission or vision; Issues of mission/vision rarely raised to board for broad discussion	<input type="checkbox"/> Informal and active discussion within small groups with issues (e.g., relevance of mission) brought before the board on ad-hoc basis when there is enough momentum	<input type="checkbox"/> Formalized process (e.g., board retreats) to foster active board member participation in examining mission-related issues	

Engage In Strategic Planning and Policy Decisions	Poor (1)	Average (2)	Good (3)	Distinctive (4)	Comments:
<p>Process for strategic planning and quality of board participation</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No formal process for strategic planning and little takes place</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Formal process exists but used on ad-hoc basis; mainly staff driven with very little involvement by board members in developing the plan; board largely "rubber stamps"</p> <p>plan with limited discussion</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Process exists for developing strategic plan but does not specify the framework for strategic planning (e.g, main elements /issues that plan must address); mainly staff-driven; active discussion by the entire board before approving the strategic plan</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Formal process for board involvement that specifies broad framework (timing and content) for strategic planning; joint board and staff ownership of strategic plan with some board members heavily involved; active discussion by the entire board supported by needed facts/ materials before final approval</p>	
<p>Quality of strategic plan</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No formal plan; board members /staff would not describe key points of the strategy in the same way</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Strategic plan exists but has major holes in one or more of: goals, situation analysis, options considered, expected outcomes, resource implications, responsibilities</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> All key strategic elements addressed in plan; clear linkage of programs to mission and vision; unresolved issues identified for further investigation</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Robust plan covers all key strategic elements; agreed upon program outcomes are tightly linked to mission and vision and results inform subsequent decisions; clear plan for closing resource gaps if any</p>	
<p>Agreement on distinction between board-level and management-level decisions</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> There is frequent disagreement between board/individual members and staff on appropriate level of board involvement in issues; CEO/ staff feel "micromanaged" or "unsupported"; board feels disconnected</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Debates, when they occur, usually involve the behaviors of one/a few members; board/staff feel surprises (need for rapid decisions or surprising decision outcomes) occur more frequently than necessary</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Board and staff have high-level understanding of distinction between board and management decisions; all parties believe current model generally works well, but a few notable surprises mark recent history</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Board and staff have a shared understanding of relative roles (written or explicitly discussed); all parties feel their views are heard in the process; frequent interaction between CEO and Board Chair ensure "no surprises" environment</p>	

Select, Evaluate and Develop CEO		Poor (1)	Average (2)	Good (3)	Distinctive (4)	Comments:
Succession planning	<div><input type="checkbox"/> Board has no clear succession plan</div>	<div><input type="checkbox"/> Board has informal discussion with CEO on succession and on identifying candidates before need for a CEO transition arises</div>	<div><input type="checkbox"/> Board has explicit view on succession and works with CEO to identify internal candidates with leadership potential</div>	<div><input type="checkbox"/> Board has explicit view on succession and actively works with the CEO to identify internal candidates and provide development opportunities for the top 3-5 candidates to "round out" their skills</div>		
Evaluation and development process	<div><input type="checkbox"/> Evaluations are subjective and occur on ad-hoc basis; most board members are unaware of process or feedback messages</div>	<div><input type="checkbox"/> Evaluations performed annually against pre-agreed criteria; board members have opportunity to provide input to process</div>	<div><input type="checkbox"/> Evaluations performed formally and at least annually against pre-agreed criteria; written feedback messages reinforced through CEO compensation</div>	<div><input type="checkbox"/> Evaluations performed at least annually against pre-defined criteria; evaluation includes 360-degree feedback and includes a self-assessment by the CEO. Written feedback includes skill development plan. CEO compensation decision reinforces view of performance</div>		
Search process (when required)	<div><input type="checkbox"/> Little discussion of criteria for new CEO; roles/decision-making process unclear</div>	<div><input type="checkbox"/> Limited discussion of criteria and search plan by board; board members feel "left out" of process; frustration with quality of candidates considered</div>	<div><input type="checkbox"/> Formal criteria and plan discussed at board; internal and external candidates considered and at least one strong candidate emerges</div>	<div><input type="checkbox"/> Formal search criteria expectations for first 2 years, and search plan received broad board support; internal and external candidates reviewed and "true choice" between candidates can be made</div>		

Provide expertise and access for organizational needs	Poor (1)	Average (2)	Good (3)	Distinctive (4)	Comments:
Board understanding of needed access and influence to support organizational objectives, (e.g., legislative access, community access)	<input type="checkbox"/> Topic of access not specifically discussed or seen as source of board assistance to organization	<input type="checkbox"/> Board understanding of needs for access based on periodic requests from CEO; needs largely determined on reactive basis to need of the moment	<input type="checkbox"/> Board understands needs based on strategic planning discussions with CEO/staff, although specific plans or relationship goals are not identified	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs for access and influence based on strategic view of organizational objectives; needs identified in detail to allow meaningful roles to be identified for individual directors	
Ability of board to provide access and influence needed	<input type="checkbox"/> Board plays no role providing access or influence for organizational needs	<input type="checkbox"/> Board provides access and influence sporadically but many needs not addressed, or support is seen to be of little value to the organization	<input type="checkbox"/> Board provides access to most needed individuals and institutions; access and influence seen as of moderate value to institution	<input type="checkbox"/> Board proactively reaches out to further organizational goals and is frequently very influential in achieving them	
Board understanding of expertise needed for organizational objectives, e.g., financial, strategic, subject matter expertise	<input type="checkbox"/> Topic of expertise not specifically discussed or seen as source of board assistance to organization	<input type="checkbox"/> Board understanding of needs for expertise based on periodic requests from CEO; needs largely determined on reactive basis to need of the moment	<input type="checkbox"/> Board understands needs based on strategic planning discussions with CEO/staff	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs for expertise based on strategic view of organizational objectives; needs identified in detail to allow meaningful roles to be identified for individual directors	
Build reputation	Poor (1)	Average (2)	Good (3)	Distinctive (4)	Comments:
Board understanding of reputation objectives and of the role the board can play in building/enhancing reputation	<input type="checkbox"/> Topic of building reputation not a priority and not specifically discussed/seen as a board role	<input type="checkbox"/> Reputation objectives understood in vague terms with little differentiation of the message between target communities	<input type="checkbox"/> Board understands key goals and differences between target communities; plan for board activity is largely undeveloped	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs for reputation building based on strategic view of organizational objectives; needs identified in detail to allow meaningful roles to be identified for individual directors	

Build reputation	Poor (1)	Average (2)	Good (3)	Distinctive (4)	Comments:
Board effectiveness in enhancing reputation of organization among stakeholders	<input type="checkbox"/> Board plays almost no role in helping build/enhance the reputation of the organization among stakeholders	<input type="checkbox"/> Individual board members participate when invited to community events; effectiveness of Board activity unclear	<input type="checkbox"/> Gaps exist vis-a-vis some key constituencies; board member effectiveness as reputation builders varies greatly	<input type="checkbox"/> Board members proactively reach out in community to build awareness and excitement about the organization; board members seem to be very effective ambassadors for organization	
Oversee financial performance, ensure risk management	Poor (1)	Average (2)	Good (3)	Distinctive (4)	Comments:
Board role in financial planning	<input type="checkbox"/> 1-year budgets prepared with little input from board	<input type="checkbox"/> Board actively reviews annual financial plan; investment objectives generally understood, but not clearly communicated to fund managers	<input type="checkbox"/> Board reviews and approves 3- to 5-year financial plan; written investment policy guides actions of fund managers	<input type="checkbox"/> Board's active involvement in preparing/ reviewing multi-year financial plan results in robust discussion of resource allocation, funding plans, and investment objectives in context of strategic goals	
Ongoing monitoring of financial and investment performance	<input type="checkbox"/> Sporadic or infrequent review of results vs. budget with little opportunity for timely intervention; few board members feel they understand financial reports	<input type="checkbox"/> Board monitors financial statements at set intervals (monthly or quarterly); open issues requiring more investigation or "surprise results" are common occurrences	<input type="checkbox"/> Board monitors financial results regularly; staff can answer most questions and responds in timely and thoughtful manner to more complex inquiries; discussion not as "forward- looking" as some board members would like	<input type="checkbox"/> Board monitors financial statements regularly; key performance indicators routinely reported to whole board; well-prepared staff can explain variances and discuss potential corrective actions; "no surprises" because of trust-based communication with staff	

Oversee financial performance, ensure risk management	Poor (1)	Average (2)	Good (3)	Distinctive (4)	Comments:
Fiduciary and other regulatory compliance	<input type="checkbox"/> No independent audit of financial results or processes; Limited understanding of the compliance required to regulatory bodies	<input type="checkbox"/> Independent audit performed and results discussed between board and auditor; little board involvement with compliance to other regulatory bodies	<input type="checkbox"/> Independent audit performed; results discussed with the board; Board reviews reports to/from key regulatory bodies	<input type="checkbox"/> Board ensures timely, independent audit of results and internal processes; board understands compliance required to regulatory bodies; feedback from auditors/regulators forms basis of recovery plan monitored by board	
Board role in risk management	<input type="checkbox"/> No clear understanding or discussion of risks/ exposures facing organization	<input type="checkbox"/> Some discussion of key risks and mitigation strategies (insurance), but effort is largely ad hoc or in response to an event and does not cover all major exposure categories	<input type="checkbox"/> Board annually reviews financial and other risks as well as mitigation policies, but surprises regarding exposure or gaps in coverage do occur	<input type="checkbox"/> Board annually reviews potential sources of risk and mitigation plans; surprises or gaps in coverage are few	
Monitor performance and ensure accountability	Poor (1)	Average (2)	Good (3)	Distinctive (4)	Comments:
Board involvement in developing performance metrics	<input type="checkbox"/> Performance against mission is discussed infrequently with no pre-determined goals	<input type="checkbox"/> Discussion of strategy leads to setting programmatic goals for year. Most goals focus on activity levels.	<input type="checkbox"/> Board works with staff to set goals for 1- to 3-year period; metrics include activity levels and some efficiency or effectiveness measures	<input type="checkbox"/> Board works with staff to set outcome based metrics and goals as well as activity/efficiency metrics; targets set for 1 to 3 year period. Performance of comparable institutions is used to inform targets	

Monitor performance and ensure accountability	Poor (1)	Average (2)	Good (3)	Distinctive (4)	Comments:
Process for monitoring performance	<input type="checkbox"/> No formal process for monitoring program performance exists	<input type="checkbox"/> Infrequent discussion of performance and no feedback to the strategic planning or CEO evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/> Routine discussion of performance against programmatic objectives but no clear feedback mechanism into strategic planning or CEO evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/> Board routinely monitors and discusses the performance of program/organization and uses results to inform the strategic plan, resource allocation, and evaluation of the CEO	
Board understanding of accountability	<input type="checkbox"/> Board does not view itself accountable to any stakeholders	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited discussion of accountability. Divergent views regarding key stakeholders	<input type="checkbox"/> Board discussion of accountability occurs in unstructured format results in consensus; discussion not turned into action, e.g., stakeholders communications	<input type="checkbox"/> Board identifies primary stakeholders and ensures that performance results are communicated effectively to the stakeholders	
Process for obtaining and using feedback from stakeholders	<input type="checkbox"/> Board has no process to obtain feedback from mechanism stakeholders	<input type="checkbox"/> Feedback from stakeholders is limited to presentations by staff or "highlights" / presentations / interactions with service recipients at board meetings; not all stakeholders represented.	<input type="checkbox"/> Board does receive positive and negative feedback from stakeholders but feedback is anecdotal; board discusses feedback with CEO / staff and agrees on areas of improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Board has formal process in place (e.g., stakeholder committee) to obtain feedback from stakeholders without filters by the staff; board ensures that the results from the stakeholder feedback are used to inform strategy and resource allocation	
Improve board performance	Poor (1)	Average (2)	Good (3)	Distinctive (4)	Comments:
Goal setting for the board as a follow-on to strategic planning	<input type="checkbox"/> No specific goals exist for the board	<input type="checkbox"/> Board translates strategic plan into goals in an ad-hoc manner and does not assign responsibilities to board committees	<input type="checkbox"/> Board translates strategic plan into goals only in certain categories	<input type="checkbox"/> Board translated the strategic plan for the organization into a set of concrete goals for the board and board committees, including timelines and required staff support	

Improve board performance	Poor (1)	Average (2)	Good (3)	Distinctive (4)	Comments:
Evaluation of board performance against goals	<input type="checkbox"/> No evaluation is conducted by the board on its performance against the goals	<input type="checkbox"/> Board informally evaluates its performance on major objectives	<input type="checkbox"/> Board formally evaluates its performance on major goals but no feedback mechanism exists to improve board functioning	<input type="checkbox"/> Board evaluates its performance against the goals and uses the lessons learned to develop plans to improve board effectiveness	
Process for evaluating individual board members	<input type="checkbox"/> No process in place for individual board member performance	<input type="checkbox"/> Evaluations of individual board members occur informally as part of re-nomination process. Evaluations are light touch and board seems to have a lot of "deadwood"	<input type="checkbox"/> Board committee in place to evaluate individual board member performance jointly with board member at time of re-nomination; most board members are seen as valuable contributors to organization governance	<input type="checkbox"/> Board committee in place to evaluate individual board member performance periodically and jointly discusses how to help a director give his/her best to the organization; little collective tolerance for directors who are not active in organization governance and support	
Developing a plan for improving board performance over time	<input type="checkbox"/> Board discussion of its own performance is very limited and largely unstructured	<input type="checkbox"/> Informal process for evaluating board performance is largely CEO/chair driven and plan for improvement is not widely known by board members	<input type="checkbox"/> Board organizes to review performance every several years; board leadership generally seen to have a plan for improving performance	<input type="checkbox"/> Formal process (e.g., annual self-assessment) results in a clear plan for improvement; board collectively owns the topic of improving its value to the organization	
Additional Comments:					

SECTION 2: PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF RESPONSIBILITIES FOR THE NEXT 1-2 YEARS

A nonprofit board adds value by undertaking each of the nine responsibilities identified below. However, boards rarely have time to focus on all of the responsibilities so it is important for them to prioritize activities depending upon the context of the organization. As you complete this section, please choose those areas of potential board focus that are most needed over the next 1 to 2 years to ensure the organization succeeds against its mission.

How important is it for your board to focus on:	Low	Medium	High
Clarifying the organization's mission or vision	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Resolving key strategic or policy issues (please identify issues below)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Developing the CEO	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Developing the financial resources needed to support the strategy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Providing expertise or access to support organizational priorities (please identify priorities below)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Building/enhancing reputation of organization with key stakeholders/ community (Please identify stakeholders/ community targets below)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overseeing financial performance and ensuring adequate risk management	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Assessing performance against mission and key program priorities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Improving board performance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please add any additional thoughts to explain your answers or identify additional needs:

SECTION 3: ENABLERS OF BOARD EFFECTIVENESS

Composition	Poor (1)	Average (2)	Good (3)	Distinctive (4)	Comments:
Orientation of new members	<input type="checkbox"/> No formal orientation for new board members	<input type="checkbox"/> Formal orientation exists but misses key topics; new directors feel welcomed, but take a while to get up to speed	<input type="checkbox"/> Effective formal orientation covers key topics, but misses the opportunity to welcome/listen to new directors. Initial new director roles sometimes don't make sense/inspire new members	<input type="checkbox"/> Formal orientation process covers key topics (mission, organization, finances, responsibilities of directors); committee assignments are welcomed by new directors who quickly become effective members of the board	
Leadership (Board Chair and Committee Leaders)	Poor (1)	Average (2)	Good (3)	Distinctive (4)	Comments:
Process for deciding who leads and for how long	<input type="checkbox"/> No clear process exists for selecting the leadership and/or most members do not know the selection process	<input type="checkbox"/> Process exists for selecting/transiting board and committee leadership; Some confusion within board about process or election criteria or leadership tenures	<input type="checkbox"/> Process exists for selecting leadership at board and committee levels although leadership criteria not articulated. Expected duration of leadership positions not articulated	<input type="checkbox"/> Clear, well-understood, and accepted process is in place to select and transition board and committee leadership. Board leadership decisions seen to strengthen performance of institution	
Succession planning and development of board leaders	<input type="checkbox"/> No process (formal or informal) in place to cultivate next generation of board leaders	<input type="checkbox"/> Next generation of leaders has yet to be identified by current leaders. Succession decisions result in need for much learning on the job	<input type="checkbox"/> Future leaders are identified and given opportunities to lead. Most transitions are seen as appropriate and timely	<input type="checkbox"/> Process in place to identify and develop board leaders; committee assignments rotated to give board members experience and opportunity to lead; board seen to have a rich set of future leaders	

Leadership (Board Chair and Committee Leaders)		Poor (1)	Average (2)	Good (3)	Distinctive (4)	Comments:
Quality of leadership relationship with CEO / key staff	<input type="checkbox"/> Leadership working relationship with the CEO is strained	<input type="checkbox"/> Board chair has a good relationship with CEO though relationships with staff are under-developed; committee leaders do not interact with CEO or staff very often or effectively	<input type="checkbox"/> The board chair has an effective relationship with the CEO and key staff although at the committee level, the quality of relationship varies	<input type="checkbox"/> Board leadership has an effective working relationship with the CEO and key staff		
Effectiveness of board leadership	<input type="checkbox"/> Current board leadership is largely ineffective given the needs of the organization	<input type="checkbox"/> Current effectiveness of board leadership group (chair, committee chairs) is mixed, due to varying degrees of skill and enthusiasm	<input type="checkbox"/> For the most part, board leadership is effective with a few exceptions	<input type="checkbox"/> Current board leadership has the necessary skills, enthusiasm, energy, and time to provide leadership to the board		
Processes	Poor (1)	Average (2)	Good (3)	Distinctive (4)	Comments:	
Quality of preparation	<input type="checkbox"/> Calendar of meetings for the year and agenda for individual meetings not established in timely manner; Board receives materials during meetings	<input type="checkbox"/> Calendar of meetings established although anticipated content not included; Board receives agenda and some materials ahead of meeting; Materials not of appropriate quality for board to prepare; Additional meeting time required to get the board up to speed	<input type="checkbox"/> Board receives agenda and meeting materials for individual meetings in a timely manner; Annual calendar allows appropriate time for previewing/ consideration of key decisions	<input type="checkbox"/> Calendar of meetings set and distributed for the year; agenda for the individual meetings sent out ahead of time with indication of expected focus/ high impact areas for board consideration; board receives quality background materials well in advance of meetings and arrive prepared		

Processes	Poor (1)	Average (2)	Good (3)	Distinctive (4)	Comments:
Effective meeting processes	<input type="checkbox"/> Meetings often start late and run long. Majority of time spend on presentations to board without sufficient time for board debate and discussion	<input type="checkbox"/> Meetings start and end on time although structure of agenda revolves around CEO/staff's show and tell; Significant board debate on issues not expected or desired	<input type="checkbox"/> Significant amount of agenda is CEO/staff 'show and tell'; Board has some time to debate but discussion is often cut short due to time constraints. Some members do not contribute, although they could	<input type="checkbox"/> Meetings start and end on time and time is managed to ensure board discussion on all important topics; minimal 'show and tell' by the CEO/staff; most time dedicated to board discussion and debate on important issues. Board members feel involved and their contributions valued	
Fun and Passion	<input type="checkbox"/> Board views meetings as a chore; board members do not socialize before or after the meetings	<input type="checkbox"/> Board meetings are for the most part work driven and lack opportunities for camaraderie building and connecting to the mission; Members don't mind having to miss a meeting now and then	<input type="checkbox"/> Board meetings are for the most part productive and fun; some attempts are made to include activities to build camaraderie and connect board members with the mission; attendance is typically high	<input type="checkbox"/> Board interactions are productive and enjoyable; good mixture of work and fun activities including effective efforts to connect board members to the mission (e.g., site visits); board members hate to miss meetings	
Additional Comments:					

Sewerage and Water Board of New Orleans

Strategic Plan 2011-2020

Mission, Vision, and Values

Our mission is to provide safe drinking water to everyone in New Orleans; to remove waste water for safe return to the environment; to drain away storm water; to provide water for fire protection; to provide information about products and services; and to do all of this continuously at a reasonable cost to the community.

Our vision is to have the trust and confidence of our customers for reliable and sustainable water services.

We believe in these values as the foundation for how we will perform our mission and pursue our vision:

- We will focus on our customers and stakeholders.
- We will treat each customer and employee with dignity and respect.
- We will value each employee, their work, and their commitment.
- We will be truthful, trustworthy and transparent.
- We will be knowledgeable and diligent in the performance of our duties.
- We will use financial resources prudently.
- We will be accountable for our performance.
- We will continuously improve our performance.
- We will ensure that the systems that provide our services remain viable for future generations.
- We will remain on the job and will be prepared for storms and other risks.

Goals and Objectives

We are responsible for meeting the requirements of our customers and stakeholders. We have established goals to meet these customer and stakeholder requirements and objectives to measure our performance in meeting these goals:

Customer ratepayers to whom we provide drinking water and waste water services:

- We will provide drinking water and wastewater services that meet or exceed regulatory requirements.
- We will provide accurate bills.
- We will provide timely, responsive and reliable information about our services.
- We will respond promptly to requests for water services at homes and businesses.
- We will be efficient with the use of resources in providing these services.

Citizen taxpayers and adjacent communities to whom we provide drainage water services:

- We will provide drainage services that mitigate the risk of flooding.
- We will coordinate our efforts with the City of New Orleans and other utility service providers.
- We will be efficient with the use of resources in providing this service.

Federal, State and Local Elected Officials to whom we are accountable for our performance:

- We will provide accurate and comprehensive information.
- We will be responsive to requests for assistance.
- We will support community programs and initiatives.

Employees with whom we work to provide water services:

- We will provide a safe work environment.
- We will provide meaningful work and fair compensation.
- We will provide training and opportunities to develop and succeed.

The Environment that we share with each other and the natural world:

- We will return water to the environment in a condition better than we received it.
- We will create beneficial reuse for the solids that are created in our treatment processes.
- We will be considerate of the impact that our choices of fuel and materials have on the environment.

US Environmental Protection Agency, Louisiana Department of Health and Hospitals, Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality and other government agencies who regulate our drinking water and waste water quality:

- We will comply with the Safe Drinking Water Act, the Clean Water Act, the Modified Consent Decree, and all other water and air quality laws and regulations.

US Army Corps of Engineers, Southeast Louisiana Flood Protection Authority East and West, Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority of Louisiana, and City of New Orleans Department of Public Works with whom we work to construct drainage facilities:

- We will work collaboratively on the design, construction and operation of drainage facilities.

Bondholders to whom we owe repayment of principal with interest:

- We will comply with the covenants of our bond issues.
- We will work to maintain and improve our creditworthiness to protect the value of their investment.

Suppliers and Economically Disadvantaged Business Enterprises from whom we purchase services and materials:

- We will provide a fair marketplace to openly compete for opportunities to provide services and materials.
- We will pay invoices for services and materials on a timely basis.

Future Citizens and Businesses of New Orleans to whom we owe viable water systems:

- We will operate, maintain, rehabilitate, and replace the drinking water, sewerage, and drainage systems to deliver water services in perpetuity.

All Stakeholders to whom we are accountable:

- We will diligently monitor, measure, and report on our performance.

Assumptions

These are the key assumptions on issues that affect us:

Customer Expectations:

- Customers expect improved efficiency and responsiveness in resolution of their concerns.
- Future improvements in detection technology for microbes and pharmaceuticals will increase customer concerns for water quality.
- The community will expect system renewal to be closely coordinated with other community projects.
- Neighbors will expect us to maintain safe and attractive facilities.

Drinking Water Quality:

- Customers will expect water quality that consistently meets or exceeds regulatory requirements.
- Increasing regulatory requirements will increase operating costs and capital investments.

Wastewater Treatment:

- Customers will expect waste water to be returned safely to the environment.

Stormwater Drainage:

- Customers will expect seamless service between Sewerage and Water Board and City of New Orleans Department of Public Works responsibilities for providing drainage service.

Financial Resources:

- Productivity enhancements and aggressive cost control will be required to reduce the impact on rate increases.
- All stakeholders will demand prudent and effective management of resources.

Employees:

- Retirements of experienced employees will require succession planning and knowledge transfer.
- Improvements in internal customer satisfaction will be needed to drive improvements in external customer satisfaction.

Business and Environmental Influences:

- Future revenues will be closely linked to economic growth of community.
- Consumption per household will decline due to conservation fixtures and fewer persons per household.
- Extreme weather events, sea level rise, shifting precipitation and runoff patterns, temperature changes, and resulting changes in water quality will require adaptive changes to ensure resiliency and sustainability.
- Increased security capabilities will be needed to mitigate the risk of contamination to the drinking water system.

Additional Expenditures:

- Repayment of the Orleans Parish portion of the Southeastern Louisiana Flood Control Program project costs will exceed current millage revenues.
- Operation of the new permanent pump stations at Lake Pontchartrain will add significant annual expenses.
- Participation in operation and maintenance costs of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway West Closure Complex will add significant annual expenses.

Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats

These are the key internal strengths upon which we will build, internal weaknesses that we will resolve, external opportunities for partnership with others that we will pursue, and external threats for which we will be prepared:

Strengths

- Employee commitment, knowledge, and experience
- Abundant water supply
- Capability to provide high quality products and services
- Coordination with stakeholders
- Environmental stewardship
- Reliable backup power supply
- Demonstrated record of success in reliable delivery of service
- Available capacity to support community growth
- Effective relationships with federal regulators

Weaknesses

- Unresolved damage to buried infrastructure
- Extensive water loss
- Deferred maintenance of infrastructure
- Aging workforce
- Difficulty in hiring experienced technical employees
- Unfunded liability for pensions and other post-employment benefits, unfunded settlements from liability claims, and unfunded reimbursement requirements for system improvements in support of street paving projects
- Information technology systems which have exceeded their design life
- Insufficient documentation of work processes
- Governance issues that limit financial strength
- Collection Practices
- Process for changes to rates and millages

Opportunities

- FEMA funding of water and sewer system replacement
- Improved coordination with economic development agencies
- Improved coordination with departments of the City of New Orleans
- Improved methods for communicating with the public
- Customer education of financial requirements
- Collect revenues from entities receiving free services
- Purchase natural gas on the open market
- Improved information to customers on leaks and repairs

Threats

- Hurricanes
- Potential for failure of levee system
- Reduced population and jobs in the community
- Liability claims that exceed financial capacity
- Climate changes that impair our readiness to serve
- Saltwater intrusion up the Mississippi River
- Attacks against security of employees and infrastructure

Strategies and Tactics

These are the strategies and tactics that we will implement to fulfill our mission, reach our vision, and achieve our goals and objectives.

I. We will build necessary infrastructure in coordination with City of New Orleans Department of Public Works and other Infrastructure providers (*Infrastructure Committee / Executive Director, General Superintendent, and Deputy General Superintendent*).

A. Water System

1. Replace water distribution system.
2. Rehabilitate water treatment plants.
3. Rehabilitate raw water intake stations.
4. Replace water meters with advanced metering infrastructure city-wide.
5. Improve water plant security.

B. Sewer System

1. Replace wastewater collection system.
2. Rehabilitate sewer pump stations.
3. Construct improvements at East Bank Sewage Treatment Plant.

C. Drainage System

1. Prepare to operate three pump stations constructed by Corps of Engineers at canals near lakefront.
2. Participate in drainage system improvements in coordination with SELA Program.
3. Participate in storm proofing for drainage pump stations.
4. Determine feasibility of performing street drainage maintenance work on a fee-for-service basis.

D. Power System and Other Utility Facilities

1. Rehabilitate or replace boilers, turbines, and other power system facilities.
2. Construct secondary power for all drainage pump stations.

E. Regulatory Compliance

1. Prepare for treatment of pharmaceuticals, personal care products, and other emerging contaminants.
2. Prepare for adaptation to climate changes.

F. Infrastructure Planning

1. Develop a facilities plan for 2015 to 2035.

II. We will rebuild our financial capabilities (*Finance Committee / Executive Director and Deputy Director*).

- A.** Develop and update ten-year financial plan that identifies sources and uses of funds for construction, operation, and maintenance of water, sewer, and drainage systems and allocates the cost of service to customers of the water, sewer, and drainage systems.

- B. Adopt a financial management policy for financial planning, budgeting, accounting, and reporting; debt management; investment of funds; ratemaking and tax setting; and responsibilities for financial management.
- C. Establish rates and charges to meet financial plan requirements.
- D. Reduce expenses through process documentation, analysis and redesign and integration of new technologies.
- E. Repay unfunded current liabilities.
- F. Reduce quantity of free water provided.
- G. Align resources to ensure that highest priority initiatives are funded.
- H. Pursue program of debt management initiatives to meet bond rating agency criteria for target credit rating.
- I. Develop new sources of funding other than water and sewer rate increases.

III. **We will improve our customer service capabilities (*Operations Committee / Executive Director and Deputy Director*).**

- A. Reduce time between problem identification and resolution for customer complaints.
- B. Evaluate and install improved metering and meter reading processes and technologies.
- C. Provide online Account Management capabilities for all customers.
- D. Provide appointment scheduling and work order tracking capabilities for customer work requests.
- E. Provide field customer service representatives with online access to maps and other information.
- F. Provide relationship managers for large commercial and industrial accounts and neighborhood associations.
- G. Improve internal customer satisfaction through front-line employee participation in process improvements.
- H. Establish additional customer service center.
- I. Implement Service Assurance Program.
 - 1. Provide additional funding for bill payment assistance through Water Help program.
 - 2. Expand Water Help program to provide assistance with plumbing repairs.
 - 3. Pursue legislative changes to allow bill adjustments for water lost through customer leaks.
 - 4. Evaluate waiver of service charges and other fees based upon means testing for qualifying low-income elderly and disabled customers.

IV. We will enhance our business performance (*Operations Committee / Executive Director and Deputy Director*).

- A. Develop business plans for implementation of each strategy in this strategic plan.
- B. Establish measurements and reporting standards.
- C. Determine organization structure to meet operating objectives and support implementation of business plans.
- D. Develop and execute Information Technology Business Plan to improve business systems.
- E. Develop program to identify, assess, and mitigate business risks.
- F. Improve coordination of our efforts with other service providers, including Businesses and Economic Development Entities.
- G. Improve collection of debts.
- H. Improve business capabilities through process documentation, analysis and redesign and integration of new technologies.
- I. Reform Board governance practices.
 - 1. Reduce the length of Board member terms.
 - 2. Limit the number of consecutive terms.
 - 3. Establish requisite qualifications for Board members.
 - 4. Reduce the number of Board members.
 - 5. Evaluate functions and responsibilities of Board committees.
 - 6. Revise Process for appointment of Board members.
- J. Perform all necessary activities required by Federal Consent Decree.
- K. Perform annual water loss audit.
- L. Create economic opportunities consistent with City of New Orleans programs for participation by economically disadvantaged and local business enterprises.
- M. Establish process for providing detailed written status reports and construction projects by district.

V. We will enhance the capabilities of our employees (*Executive Committee / Executive Director, General Superintendent, Deputy General Superintendent, and Deputy Director*).

- A. Improve appraisal of performance for all employees.
- B. Utilize best practices for safety improvement.

- C. Develop work plans for all management employees.
 - D. Develop training plans for all employees.
 - E. Review employee incentive programs for effectiveness.
 - F. Expand amount of information communicated from leadership.
 - G. Perform succession planning and knowledge transfer for all managerial positions and all positions held by DROP Program participants.
 - H. Provide opportunities for feedback from front-line employees to senior management.
 - I. Assess competitiveness of total compensation program for recruitment and retention.
 - J. Improve the quality of worklife for employees.
- VI. We will protect the environment (*Infrastructure Committee / Executive Director, General Superintendent, Deputy General Superintendent, and Deputy Director*).
- A. Construct wetlands assimilation, heat dryers, and other beneficial reuse projects.
 - B. Provide leadership in water environmental issues affecting Southeastern Louisiana.



"RE-BUILDING THE CITY'S WATER SYSTEMS FOR THE 21ST CENTURY"

Sewerage & Water Board of NEW ORLEANS

MITCHELL J. LANDRIEU, President
WM. RAYMOND MANNING, President Pro-Tem

625 ST. JOSEPH STREET
NEW ORLEANS, LA 70165 • 504-529-2837 OR 52W-ATER
www.swbno.org

October 19, 2015

The Governance Committee met on Monday, October 19, 2015 in the 2nd Floor Board Room, 625 St. Joseph Street, New Orleans, LA. The meeting convened at 1:30 PM.

ATTENDANCE

PRESENT:

Alan Arnold, Vice Chair
Robin Barnes
Suchitra Satpathi, Mayor's Representative

ABSENT:

Kerri Kane, Chair
Kimberly Thomas
Marion Bracy

Others:

Cedric S. Grant, Executive Director
Joseph R. Becker, General Superintendent
Nolan P. Lambert, Special Counsel
Robert K. Miller, Deputy Director

ACTION ITEMS:

1. Cooperative Endeavor Agreement with City of New Orleans for the coordination of all repair, maintenance, and construction projects with city agencies (R-189-2015)

Robin Barnes moved to accept staff recommendation for the renewal of Cooperative Endeavor Agreement with the City of New Orleans for the coordination of all repairs, maintenance, and construction projects with city agencies and to forward to the full Board for approval. It was seconded by Suchitra Satpathi and the motion carried.

2. Cooperative Endeavor Agreement with Greater New Orleans Foundation (R-173-2015)

Robin Barnes moved to accept staff recommendation for the Cooperative Endeavor Agreement with the Greater New Orleans Foundation and to forward to the full Board for approval. It was seconded by Suchitra Satpathi and the motion carried.

3. Cooperative Endeavor Agreement with City of New Orleans for the Permanent Pavement Restoration of Utility Cuts (R-198-2015)

Robin Barnes moved to accept staff recommendation for the Cooperative Endeavor Agreement with the City of New Orleans for the permanent pavement restoration of utility cuts (R-198-2015)

and to forward to the full Board for approval. It was seconded by Suchitra Satpathi and the motion carried.

PRESENTATION ITEMS:

4. Board Self-Assessment

Mr. Miller gave an overview of the McKinsey & Company's Nonprofit Board Self-Assessment Tool. He stated the tool is designed to help nonprofit organizations assess their board's performance and identify priorities for board activities going forward. The output of the assessment is intended to focus discussion among board members around the governance activities that will result in the greatest benefit for the organization.

5. Audit Committee Charter

Mr. Miller gave an overview of the draft Audit Committee Charter. This draft was created based on recommendations by the National Association of Corporate Directors blue ribbon commission on audit committees. The Committee members agreed that a chartering document was appropriate for each committee and directed staff to forward this draft to the Audit Committee for their consideration.

6. Committee meeting Schedule

Mr. Miller noted staff is working with Board Members to determine the dates and times to schedule meetings of each committee.

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting adjourned at 2:00 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mr. Alan C. Arnold
Vice Chairperson