

Planning Group Process to Develop a MRRIC Charter (Missouri River Recovery Implementation Committee)

Membership Committee Conference Call Notes November 19, 2007

Present: Cheryl Chapman, Randy Asbury, Bill Beacom, Jack Majeres, Skip Meisner, Lynn Muench, Larry Mires, Paul Lepisto, Tom Graves, Lanny Meng, Joe Gibbs, Pat Cassidy, Mike Eng (U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution), Ruth Siguenza (facilitation team), Steve Miller (facilitation team), Doug Huston (facilitation team)

1) Setting the Context

a) Philosophical Questions

- i) The Drafting Team still needs to decide if this is going to be a collaborative committee or purely stakeholder committee.

b) Recap of November 16, 2007 conference call information from Mike Eng

- i) The federal agencies are uncomfortable with the two tier participation system for them outlined in the Draft MRRIC Charter distributed for public review (version 24).

2) Committee Discussion

a) The committee had the following concerns

- i) This process appears to be moving to a point where the stakeholders are just an afterthought.
 - (1) It was pointed out that the various MRRIC basis documents have always envisioned federal agency participation.
- ii) The committee questioned whether being a collaborative committee meant the federal agencies had to be part of the consensus process.
- iii) Some committee members expressed concern that the Drafting Team did not have the authority to tell the federal agencies how to participate.

iv) The committee discussed the fact that people were still concerned about being overwhelmed by the federal agencies and becoming just a rubber stamp body for federal policies.

(1) It was pointed out that these concerns had already been addressed in the charter.

(a) Federal agencies are not allowed to cherry pick the charter; they have been asked to approve it all or reject it all.

(b) The federal agencies are not allowed to participate in the determination of consensus per this draft charter.

v) There was concern over participating federal agencies being represented by SES level people.

(1) There was some concern that SES level did not necessarily mean policy makers.

(2) Other committee members were concerned about getting people at the SES level to attend meetings.

vi) The committee expressed concern over having agencies such as the Park Service participating since it has no jurisdiction in the lower basin.

(1) It was pointed out that MRRIC was intended as an integrated committee, encompassing both lower and upper basin interests so all affected agencies needed to participate.

vii) The committee discussed possibly submitting several federal agency participation proposals to the Secretary for his consideration.

viii) The committee questioned whether the Drafting Team would get the Charter back for re-work if parts were rejected by the Secretary.

(1) Probably not enough time for a lot of back-and-forth discussions after the Drafting Team recommendations have been transmitted.

(2) Probably going to take a lot longer than initially anticipated to review the charter due to number and depth of reviews that will take place. This means that there is a possibility that the January Drafting Team will need to be postponed.

3) Next Steps

a) The committee decided to forward four federal agency participation proposals for Drafting Team consideration in the 11/20/07 mailing to the Planning Group.

i) Option 1 from version 24 of the Draft MRRIC Charter

ii) Option 2 from version 24 of the Draft Charter

iii) The consolidated language options contained in the November 16th e-mail from the facilitation team.

iv) The option drafted by Pat Cassidy at the request of the Membership committee on its conference call of Friday, November 16th as modified to require SES level participation from all federal agencies and the opportunity for Corps of Engineers endorsement of MRRIC consensus recommendations.

b) Both sets of conference call notes (November 16th and 19th) will be sent to the Planning Group.

c) The Planning Group will be asked to provide questions concerning federal agency participation to the facilitation team for forwarding to Larry Cieslik. The intent is for these questions to be answered at the Denver meeting.

i) These questions need to be to the facilitation team by close of business (Pacific Time), Friday, November 23, 2007.

