Rocky Mountain Restoration Initiative (RMRI)
June 1, 2020, 2:00 PM - 4:00 PM
RMRI Governance Subcommittee
Meeting Summary - FINAL

ATTENDANCE
Participants: Samantha Albert, Angela Boag, Patt Dorsey, Jason Lawhon, Kelle Reynolds, Tom Spezze, Nathan Van Schaik, Tammy Whittington, and Scott Woods

Facilitation: Heather Bergman and Samuel Wallace

ACTION ITEMS

Samuel Wallace and Heather Bergman	Revise the governance charter, theory of change diagram, and commitments table based on the feedback from the Governance Subcommittee.
Samuel Wallace	Send a Doodle to schedule the next Governance Subcommittee meeting during the week of June 15.

RMRI-COLORADO DRAFT CHARTER DISCUSSION
Meeting participants discussed and provided feedback on the RMRI-Colorado (RMRI-CO) draft governance charter. Their comments are summarized below.
- The governance charter was sent to RMRI partners for their review and comments. Some RMRI partners provided feedback and questions on the governance charter.
- The governance charter was updated to provide information on the roles and responsibilities of the subcommittees. Each subcommittee has reviewed their listed roles and responsibilities and provided feedback.
- The Biomass/Workforce Subcommittee was broken into two subcommittees: Biomass Utilization Subcommittee and Workforce Capacity Subcommittee, each with their own set of roles and responsibilities.
- The governance structure diagram needs to be edited so that the Biomass Utilization and Workforce Capacity Subcommittees are identified as two separate subcommittees.
- The Social License Subcommittee added "identify and develop natural and social science outcomes related to building social license" to their list of roles and responsibilities.
- Language was added to the roles and responsibilities of all subcommittees to indicate that priority landscape partners have the option to request support from RMRI-CO subcommittees as needed.
- The language under the "Values" of RMRI came from previous meeting summaries. The value for "Forests and Habitat" should state "Forests and Wildlife Habitat."

RMRI LEADERSHIP TEAM NOMINATING PROCESS DISCUSSION
Meeting participants discussed the nominating process for the RMRI Leadership Team. Their comments are summarized below.
- The representatives of the Leadership Team are categorized by organization, interest, and priority landscape. For people who represent organizations or priority landscapes, the organization or priority landscape partners should appoint whoever is going to represent them through an internal decision-making process.
- Those who represented interests on the RMRI Evaluation Team will represent the respective seat on the Leadership Team. However, there will need to be a process to nominate a new person when a sitting representative leaves their seat.

- The process for nominating a new Leadership Team member who represents an interest should be transparent and allow partners to provide input. Meeting participants GREED that the process to nominate a representative would begin with the outgoing representative coming up with a recommendation on who should fill the seat. The RMRI Leadership Team would then discuss and agree on a recommendation to take to the RMRI-Colorado (RMRI-CO) Stakeholder Group. Individual partners could nominate anyone else to fill the seat. The partners in the RMRI-CO Stakeholder Group would then discuss the Leadership Team recommendation and any other nominees before agreeing on who should fill the vacated seat.

RMRI LEADERSHIP TEAM TERM LIMITS DISCUSSION
Meeting participants discussed the potential to add term limits for the RMRI Leadership Team. Their comments are summarized below.
- There should not be term limits for Leadership Team seats that represent organizations and priority landscapes because they may have limited options for people who can fill their seat. There could be an option to set a minimum amount of time an appointed person must serve. Representatives from organizations and the priority landscapes will serve at the discretion of their respective organizations or priority landscape partnership without term limits.
- There could be an option to set term limits for nominated seats that represent interests. Meeting participants had differing perspectives on the benefits and drawbacks of setting term limits for nominated seats.
- Term limits could help move RMRI forward by incentivizing nominated representatives to set goals. By knowing they only have a limited time on the Leadership Team, nominated representatives will be incentivized to set and pursue their goals. When people serve indefinite terms, they have less incentive to actively pursue their goals.
- Having term limits may result in a loss of institutional knowledge and experience on the Leadership Team. Term limits could be staggered to prevent everyone with institutional knowledge from leaving at once.
- A new person could come in with new goals and disrupt the structure or momentum of ongoing work. If nominated seat representatives are term-limited, it could prevent someone who is doing a good job from returning.
- There could be terms but not term limits for nominated seats, which means that a person in a nominated seat could serve for multiple terms. Having terms but no term limits would create benchmarks for someone to consider whether they want to keep serving without requiring them to leave. Having terms but no term limits could result in less dynamism than expected as people may be more interested in having the same person continuously serve rather than having someone new. Having new people serve on nominated seats could bring in new ideas and perspectives and help expand RMRI.
- Some nominated seats may be easier to fill than others. Term limits could result in a seat remaining unfilled if there is no one else interested in filling a vacated seat. One option is to set term limits but allow a nominated representative to continue to serve if no one else is interested in taking that seat.
- One requirement for a person to serve on the Leadership Team should be that they must have attended a certain number of RMRI meetings. Rules can incentivize people to join and participate in RMRI. On the other hand, having strict quantitative requirements can limit the people who can serve on the RMRI Leadership Team and exclude some very qualified people. It may be better to have conceptual rules (i.e., someone who serves on the Leadership Team should be engaged and familiar with RMRI) rather than setting quantitative requirements.

- There could be an option to have a newly nominated representative shadow the acting nominated representative before they replace them. A shadowing process can be difficult to organize and should not be a part of the nominating process.
- Meeting participants agreed on the following proposal. A person filling a nominated seat would ideally serve no more than two consecutive two-year terms. The Leadership Team will work to recruit someone to fill a vacated seat once they have reached their term limit. The goal of recruiting someone to join the Leadership Team is to ensure a diversity of voices and perspectives on the Leadership Team. A person can serve longer than two consecutive two-year terms if no one else is interested in filling that seat. Once someone serves longer than two consecutive two-year terms, the Leadership Team will revisit the nominated seat every year to determine if someone is interested in filling the seat. A person who is filling a nominated seat should be familiar with RMRI through their involvement with the RMRI-CO Stakeholder Group, subcommittees, and/or priority landscapes and be able to bring new ideas to RMRI.

RMRI-CO DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES DISCUSSION
Meeting participants discussed whether to include a section on the RMRI-CO decision-making process. Their comments are summarized below.
- The governance charter could outline the process for how RMRI partners selected priority landscapes (i.e., process for selecting an evaluation committee). Adding this section may add too many details to the governance charter.
- The governance charter already outlines the decision-making processes for priority landscapes, the Leadership Team, and the Stakeholder Group.
- Priority landscape partners are responsible for selecting and prioritizing projects within their landscapes.
- The Leadership Team provides guidance and support to RMRI-CO and priority area partners and does not serve as a decision-making body. The. The roles and responsibilities of the Leadership Team were developed to emphasize that the Leadership Team would not be superimposing decisions on local landscape projects and priorities.
- The RMRI-CO Stakeholder Group can make decisions about RMRI priorities, but it does not serve as a decision-making body for local landscapes or for how to allocate funding. The Stakeholder Group can choose to provide resources and guidance to priority landscapes based on whether the goals and outcomes of the priority landscapes align with the goals and priorities of RMRI.
- The goal of RMRI-CO is to empower locally-driven projects with support from the RMRI-CO Stakeholder Group and guidance from the Leadership Team.
- The Leadership Team should have the flexibility to meet more than one time a year to assess whether RMRI-CO partners are delivering on outcomes.
- The governance charter emphasizes that the role and responsibility of the Leadership Team and RMRI-CO Stakeholder Group is to not serve as decision-making bodies before it outlines the actual roles and responsibilities of each group. The governance charter should first say what the roles and responsibilities of the RMRI-CO Stakeholder Group and Leadership Team are before the statement s that emphasize they do not serve as decision-making bodies.

OTHER GOVERNANCE CHARTER ADDITIONS DISCUSSION
Meeting participants discussed other potential additions to the governance charter. Their comments are summarized below.
- Meeting participants discussed whether to include a conflict resolution framework in the governance charter. The Leadership Team could resolve conflicts, but because the charter

clarifies that the Leadership Team does not serve as a decision-making body, it would be inconsistent to add the role of resolving conflicts to the Leadership Team. Adding a conflict resolution framework may begin to make the charter too formal and too lengthy. Instead, the charter will have a couple of sentences that say that RMRI-CO groups will seek to achieve agreement through consensus (an agreement that all groups can live with).

- Meeting participants discussed if they should add language that outlines the role of science, monitoring, and adaptive management to the charter. If science and monitoring were to be added to the charter, there would need to be a defined process for how science is integrated into RMRI decision-making. It may be helpful for landscapes to receive updates on new research regarding landscape-scale science from the nominated science seat on the Leadership Team. RMRI decisions should be based on science, but formal language does not need to be included in the governance charter.

- Meeting participants discussed if the governance charter should identify who is allowed to speak on behalf of RMRI and provide quotes if requested by newspapers. Local landscape partners should answer questions as they see fit, and the Communication Subcommittee should be available to support local partners by giving them messages if and when they receive media requests to make sure RMRI speaks in a single voice. The roles and responsibilities outlined for the Communications Subcommittee already address this task. There does not need to be a formal section added to the charter on the process for handling media requests; however, during the June 23 meeting, the Communications Subcommittee should give guidance on how local landscapes should respond to media requests. The Communications Subcommittee should also identify contact information for media requests at their next meeting.

LOCAL LANDSCAPE ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES DISCUSSION
Meeting participants discussed whether to add roles and responsibilities for local landscapes into the charter. Their comments are summarized below.

- The governance charter should define the roles and responsibilities of the local landscape partners.
- RMRI-Southwest Colorado (RMRI-SW) partners have developed their governance charter, and the Upper South Platte Partnership (USPP) is updating its governance charter.
- Some of the roles and responsibilities in the RMRI-SW charter include coordinating on overall outcomes and goals with RMRI-CO, determining methods and metrics to measure outcomes, and coordinating with RMRI-CO on communication outcomes. The language from the RMRI-SW charter could apply to other landscapes.
- Local landscapes should have one of their roles be to "coordinate media requests, communications, and community outreach associated with the priority area projects" to address the media request process in the charter.
- Jason Lawhon and Patt Dorsey will send the language on the roles and responsibilities of RMRI-SW to Samuel Wallace to include in the governance charter. Representatives from the Upper South Platte and Upper Arkansas should review the language to make sure it fits their expectations of their roles and responsibilities.

THEORY OF CHANGE DIAGRAM DISCUSSION
Meeting participants discussed the theory of change diagram for RMRI. Their comments are summarized below.

- The theory of change diagram broadly outlines how RMRI is expecting to move from their current status and condition to their desired goals and outcomes. The theory of change diagram identifies the assumptions and phases for RMRI to achieve its goals.

- The theory of change diagram should be organized so that the phases are sequentially ordered from top to bottom or left to right.
- The RMRI-CO subcommittees have been putting in a lot of effort to address cross-cutting issues. In Phase II of the theory of change diagram, there should be language on the work of the subcommittees to address cross-cutting issues.
- The theory of change diagram should highlight in Phase II that RMRI-CO will prioritize RMRI-SW and support the Upper Arkansas and Upper South Platte.
- The information in the theory of change diagram is broad, which makes it more useful as a communications tool for those unfamiliar with RMRI rather than as a process tool for RMRI partners. The theory of change diagram is still in draft form, and some of the phases and assumptions need to be further expanded. The Governance Subcommittee should add more details to the theory of change diagram depending on whether the theory of change is being designed for external or internal use.
- The theory of change diagram should not be included in the charter. A Strategy Subcommittee could form to develop the theory of change diagram further and provide a more refined version to RMRI-CO partners for input.

RMRI COMMITMENTS DISCUSSION
Meeting participants discussed how they should identify and track RMRI commitments. Their comments are summarized below.
- The RMRI-CO Stakeholder Group decided to prioritize Southwest Colorado as the marquee RMRI project and support the Upper Arkansas and Upper South Platte projects as additional landscapes. There are questions on how RMRI should discuss all three priority landscapes in their documents and diagrams.
- The Communications Subcommittee could develop language that clarifies that Southwest Colorado is the marquee RMRI project. Matt Lindler and Nathan Van Schaik are developing a communication action plan that focuses on Southwest Colorado, with the intention of expanding the plan to include the Upper Arkansas and Upper South Platte.
- A commitments table was created to identify the commitments that RMRI has towards Southwest Colorado, Upper Arkansas, Upper South Platte, and the cross-cutting issue subcommittees (also known as substantive subcommittees). The commitments table is a helpful tool to set expectations for Southwest Colorado as the marquee project and the Upper Arkansas and Upper South Platte. The commitments table should be shared with the RMRI Stakeholder Group once it is developed further.
- The commitments table should outline that the commitment from RMRI-CO is to prioritize investment to RMRI-SW and not direct it. It should also outline that RMRI-CO is working to connect funding and other resources with needs in all three landscapes.
- The commitments table should indicate that the RMRI substantive subcommittees will prioritize their work on Southwest Colorado while also working with the other local landscapes to develop local projects and efforts to address cross-cutting issues.
- There should be commitments with associated quantitative metrics in the commitments table (e.g., the goal is to fully fund RMRI-SW's proposal). These commitments would focus on RMRI-CO's commitment to local landscapes and not be setting goals for local priority landscape partners.
- At a local level, the partners in the Upper Arkansas and Upper South Platte landscapes are putting in time and effort to be a part of RMRI, and RMRI-CO partners need to respect the work they are putting in and make sure those landscapes feel supported.
- There could be a version of the commitments table where Southwest Colorado is in one column, and the Upper Arkansas and Upper South Platte landscapes are both in a second

column. Then, the rows are populated with the RMRI-CO Stakeholder Group and subcommittees and the corresponding commitments that each RMRI group has to the priority landscapes. The commitments table could broadly organize the commitments from the substantive and operational subcommittees rather than from each individual subcommittee. Heather Bergman will create two commitments tables based on the original commitments table and another that organizes the commitments by the RMRI Stakeholder Group, substantive subcommittees, and operational subcommittees.

- The final version of the commitments table should be placed into the governance charter.

NEXT STEPS
- Samuel Wallace and Heather Bergman will revise the governance charter, theory of change diagram, and commitments table based on the feedback from the Governance Subcommittee.
- Samuel Wallace will send out a Doodle to schedule a meeting during the week of June 15.