

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

**Membership Application Review Process Conference Call Summary
August 13, 2008**

Present:

Planning Group: Bill Beacom, Lanny Meng, Vicki Marquis, Mike Wells, John Drew (alternate), Paul Lepisto, Geno Adams, Skip Meisner, Mike Armstrong, Tom Graves, Marian Maas, Bill Lay, Tim Bryggman, Kevin Knepper, Mark Rath, Joe Gibbs, Don Jorgenson, Larry Mires

Co-Chairs: John Thorson, Cheryl Chapman

Institute Team: Sarah Palmer, Pat Lewis

Facilitation Team: Ruth Nicholson, Steve Miller, Doug Huston

Other: Todd Iveson, Missouri Attorney General's Office

1) Opening and Introductions

- a) Ruth Nicholson, Lead Facilitator, opened the call and reminded the group that a decision needed to be made on this call.

2) U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Updated Information

- a) Sarah Palmer of the U.S Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution (U.S. Institute) summarized a recent call between she and Dave Ponganis of the USACE:
 - i) The USACE is interested in input from those Planning Group members who are interested in providing it. Consensus input from the group would streamline the USACE's review in terms of the amount of paper and information to consider, but a consensus recommendation would not carry any greater or lesser weight than individual reviews.

3) Membership Application Review Process

- a) The group had several concerns with any membership application review process:
 - i) The cost of having another meeting
 - ii) Reluctance to have the group openly discussing specific individuals
 - iii) Making the process as simple as possible

iv) Timeline concerns

v) Security of the process - how to ensure inputs are authentic

b) Proposed Processes

i) The group discussed and came to agreement that the Planning Group would not review Planning Group member applications for stakeholder representation on MRRIC. For non-Planning Group member applications, the group discussed two possible processes:

(1) Individual Planning Group members would review applications and a conference call or calls would be convened by an ad-hoc group to discuss those applications that Planning Group members did not feel met the criteria.

(2) Individual Planning Group members would review the applications and forward their completed reviews to the facilitation team who would collate and compile them and then forward the results to the USACE.

ii) Given previous concerns on discussing individuals in a group, the group came to agreement on a version of process (2) above:

(1) The Planning Group would not review Planning Group member applications. A list of those Planning Group members who apply along with their primary and secondary interest categories would be supplied to Planning Group members to enable them to consider the criterion regarding balance of representation on MRRIC.

(2) Individual Planning Group members would review non-Planning Group stakeholder applications against the membership criteria published in the *Federal Register*. They would rank applicants as *meets the criteria*, *does not meet the criteria*, *no recommendation*, or *abstain*. Completed reviews would then be forwarded to the facilitation team.

(3) The facilitation team would collect and sort the reviews into three categories:

(a) Recommended - All Planning Group member evaluations indicate the candidates meet the membership criteria.

(b) Not Recommended - All Planning Group member evaluations indicate the candidates do not meet the membership criteria.

(c) No Recommendation - The Planning Group member evaluations were not unanimous in finding that a candidate did or did not meet the membership criteria. This category would not quantify or otherwise indicate the number of Planning Group members who found that any particular candidate did or did not meet the membership criteria.

(4) The facilitation team would then forward the summary of these three categories and the names of the candidates falling in each category to the USACE.

4) Next Steps

- a) The facilitation team will develop an evaluation form for the applications and distribute it to the Planning Group.
- b) The conference call notes will be issued Wednesday, August 13, 2008.
- c) The facilitation team and the institute team will develop the logistical process for getting the applications to the Planning Group members and collecting, collating, and forwarding the results as described above.