

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

**Membership Application Review Process Conference Call Summary
July 30, 2008**

Present: Bill Beacom, Jason Skold, Bill Lay, Marian Maas, John Drew, Pat Cassidy, Paul Lepisto, Lanny Meng, Jodee Pring, Skip Meisner, Joe Gibbs, Randy Asbury, Vicki Marquis, Don Jorgensen, Mike Wells, Tom Schrempp, Kevin Knepper, Lynn Muench, Mark Rath, Todd Iveson, Tom Graves, Cheryl Chapman (Co-Chair), John Thorson (Co-Chair), Sarah Palmer (U.S. Institute), Brian Manwaring (U.S. Institute), Pat Lewis (U.S. Institute), Ruth Nicholson (Lead Facilitator), Steve Miller (Co-Facilitator), Doug Huston (Note-Taker)

1) Call Opening

Ruth Nicholson, the lead facilitator, opened the call and conducted a roll.

2) Clarify Roles

Steve Miller, co-facilitator, reviewed the roles of the various persons on the call.

3) Re-Cap of Previous Call

Doug Huston, note-taker, reviewed the summary of the July 14, 2008, membership application review process conference call.

4) Federal Working Group Application Input Proposal

- a) The group discussed the Federal Working Group's proposal to provide input to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) on MRRIC membership applications. There were several concerns with this proposal:
 - i) This is not in accordance with the *Federal Register* description of the application review process.
 - ii) Past history has engendered a lack of trust between the Federal Working Group and the Planning Group
 - iii) Inserting the Federal Working Group into the process at this juncture is not acting in good faith.
- b) The institute team provided clarification that the USACE was looking for input from the Federal Working Group on any pre-existing relationships between members and an agency; input on how to fill a seat if there is more than one applicant for the seat; and how to fill seats for interest groups with no applicants.

- c) Agreement was reached on the fact that the group did not want the Federal Working Group involved in the review of MRRIC membership applications.

5) Possible Meeting to Review Applications

- a) The group had a lengthy discussion as to whether or not another meeting was necessary to review MRRIC membership applications. The concerns associated with this issue were:
 - i) The group was concerned that it was in a process grey area: the Planning Group procedures no longer applied, and the Charter also does not apply.
 - ii) The Charter requires the Planning Group to provide recommendations on initial MRRIC members to the USACE.
 - iii) Would a meeting to review membership applications be reimbursable?
 - iv) The logistics timeline for a September 4, 2008, meeting is very short; delays in decision making need to be minimized.
- b) Several proposals were made and considered:
 - i) Individual Planning Group members could review applications and provide input to the USACE.
 - ii) Individual Planning Group members could review the applications and then interested members could conduct a conference call to review the applications as a group.
 - iii) The membership criteria developed by the Drafting Team at the St. Louis meeting could be considered to satisfy the Charter requirement for the Planning Group to provide recommendations to the USACE.
 - iv) The various interest groups identified in the Charter could caucus and review the applications applicable to those groups.
 - v) Have the Review Panel and the Drafting Team meet concurrently but separately.
 - vi) Have the commander of the USACE Northwestern Division determine whether a meeting is necessary or not.
- c) The group also discussed moving the proposed first MRRIC meeting date ahead from October 1, 2008, and moving the possible membership application review meeting date back to August 28 and 29, 2008.
- d) Ultimately, no agreement was reached on whether or not to hold a membership application review meeting.

6) Next Steps

- a) The U.S. Institute was tasked with contacting the USACE and getting answers to three questions:
 - i) What is the application review process the USACE will use?
 - ii) What input does the USACE want from the Planning Group with respect to the applications?
 - iii) This group agreed it does not want the applications reviewed by the FWG. Will the Corps agree not to involve the FWG in the review process?
- b) The group will have another conference call: Wednesday, August 6, 2008, at 4:00 p.m. Central, 3:00 p.m. Mountain, and 2:00 p.m. Pacific.
- c) The facilitation team will send out an e-mail polling the Planning Group about moving the possible September 4, 2008, meeting back to August 28 and 29, 2008.