

**Rocky Mountain Restoration Initiative (RMRI)
 June 17, 2020, 1:00 PM - 3:00 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

Heather Bergman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Send the draft governance charter to the full RMRI Group before the full RMRI meeting on June 23. • Send the draft theory of change diagram to the full RMRI Group before the full RMRI meeting on June 23. • Edit the commitments table and send it out to the Governance Subcommittee for their review before it is sent out to the full RMRI group.
Heather Bergman and Samuel Wallace	Send the slides for the Governance Subcommittee update during the June 23 full RMRI meeting to the Governance Subcommittee for their review.

RMRI-COLORADO (RMRI-CO) GOVERNANCE CHARTER DISCUSSION

Meeting participants discussed the updated draft RMRI-CO governance charter. Their comments are summarized below.

- Samuel Wallace updated the governance charter based on the feedback from the Governance Subcommittee during their June 1 meeting. The updates included added information on the nominating process and terms limits for the nominated seats of the RMRI Leadership Team, clarification that RMRI-CO will seek to reach agreements through consensus, and added information on the roles and responsibilities for RMRI priority landscapes.
- The RMRI Support Team is composed of US Forest Service (USFS) staff, National Wild Turkey Federation (NWTF) staff, and the facilitation team (Heather Bergman and Samuel Wallace). The Support Team informed the subcommittee chairs and priority landscapes that they had the option to join meetings, but it is not a requirement for subcommittee chairs and priority landscapes to attend meetings.
- Meeting participants approved the added and revised the language and agreed to send it to the full RMRI group for their review. Heather Bergman will send the draft governance charter to the full RMRI Group before the full RMRI meeting on June 23. The Governance Subcommittee should request feedback on the charter but not wordsmith the document during the June 23 meeting.

THEORY OF CHANGE DIAGRAM DISCUSSION

Meeting participants discussed the updated theory of change diagram. Their comments are summarized below.

- Samuel Wallace updated the theory of change diagram based on the feedback from the Governance Subcommittee during their meeting on June 1. The updates included a re-formatting of the diagram to make it more readable, revision of the language in one of the

Phase II boxes to emphasize the prioritization of the Southwest Colorado priority landscape, and the addition of a box in Phase II to highlight the work of the subcommittees to address cross-cutting issues.

- The theory of change diagram should use the term “values” to describe RMRI’s aspirational statements around water, recreation, forests and wildlife habitat, and communities. The term “values” aligns the language of the theory of change diagram with the governance charter language.
- The theory of change diagram works better as a high-level, external-facing document rather than an internal-facing planning document. Meeting participants agreed that the theory of change diagram is ready to be shared and discussed by RMRI partners at the June 23 meeting. Heather Bergman will send the draft theory of change diagram to the full RMRI Group before the full RMRI meeting on June 23.

OUTCOMES AND OUTPUTS DISCUSSION

Meeting participants discussed how to define and determine outcomes and outputs for RMRI-CO and for the priority landscape partners. Their comments are summarized below.

- One of the boxes in the theory of change diagram refers to “develop[ing] outcomes-based performance measures” as an action step in Phase II of RMRI.
- There is a difference between outputs and outcomes. Outputs are the traditional metrics used to measure and report forestry work (e.g., acres treated, number of landowners contacted, etc.). Outcomes are the goals that those outputs achieve (e.g., percentage of the community that is protected from a wildfire, percentage of a watershed with reduced wildfire risk, etc.).
- Each desired outcome should be defined clearly and measurably. Clear and measurable outcomes allow RMRI partners to report on their accomplishments annually to demonstrate the collective impact that RMRI is having on the landscape.
- Reporting accomplishments in outcomes rather than outputs represents a shift in how forestry activities are understood and prioritized. It will be a difficult task for individual entities to define and measure outcomes in addition to outputs.
- There may be a need for both priority area landscape outcomes and statewide outcomes.
- The desired outcomes and associated metrics will be different between priority landscapes and should be tailored according to the needs and goals of the priority landscape partners. RMRI partners could then determine whether the desired outcomes align with the overall goals of RMRI. Each priority landscape could set their desired outcomes and associated metrics to determine how much progress has been made on an annual basis towards achieving their goals.
- RMRI-Southwest Colorado (RMRI-SW) partners are developing a strategy to define and measure outcomes to help them report on their achievements. The Upper South Platte and the Upper Arkansas landscape partners could work on a similar effort to define outcomes at a local level. RMRI partners could help provide guidance on how to define outcome-based measures if/as needed by local priority landscape partners.
- If priority landscapes are asked to develop outcome-based measures, they will need support and assistance. The Subcommittee should be sensitive to how much work they ask of priority area landscape partners based on how much assistance and benefits the Subcommittee provides to them.
- Outcomes are not only defined by what is achieved, but also by how it is achieved (i.e., are there any cultural shifts around how work is accomplished, etc.). Instead of asking the Upper South Platte and Upper Arkansas partners to define and measure outcomes related

to what is being accomplished, the two priority landscape partners could report on “how” they are conducting and implementing their work.

- Making a distinction between the “what is being accomplished” outcomes and the “how is it being accomplished” outcomes in the theory of change diagram is not necessary because it will be confusing for readers. Since the theory of change diagram is meant to be an external-facing document, a simpler version of the diagram will be more understandable to a general audience.

COMMITMENTS TABLE DISCUSSION

Meeting participants discussed the updated commitments table. Their comments are summarized below.

- The purpose of the RMRI commitments table is to specify the commitments RMRI is making to the priority landscapes. It is also to clarify the commitments that RMRI partners are making to the Southwest Colorado project, which is the marquee project, in comparison to the commitments being made to the Upper Arkansas and Upper South Platte landscape partners.
- Two versions were created of the commitments table based on feedback from the June 1 Governance Subcommittee meeting.
- The two versions are a bit confusing and may be difficult to understand from a third-party perspective. The commitments table would be more understandable if it was a matrix, with the priority landscapes in the left-hand column and the commitments in the first row of the table. The matrix would then have checkmarks to indicate which of the priority landscapes will receive the associated commitment. The commitments table formatting was changed to the matrix design.
- There should be a commitment cell that specifies RMRI’s full commitment to the Southwest Colorado project to support them in achieving all their project goals outlined in their RMRI proposal. The RMRI commitment to the Upper South Platte and Upper Arkansas landscapes is that RMRI will prioritize the investment of funding and staff to the landscapes but not commit to achieving all their goals as outlined in their proposals.
- The commitments table should have a cell for “additional RMRI proposal areas” in the left-hand column to include all the additional landscapes that submitted a proposal but were not selected as priority landscapes.
- Regarding the commitments of the subcommittees to the priority landscapes, each subcommittee is thinking about how to remove barriers related to their cross-cutting issue in their own way (i.e., statewide, local, or hybrid approach).
- The subcommittees, such as the Social License Subcommittee, may have some projects that are more applicable to the Upper South Platte and the Upper Arkansas landscapes than the Southwest Colorado landscape. Not all subcommittee projects need to be focused on Southwest Colorado. They also may have statewide projects that impact all areas across Colorado.
- The commitments table should have a cell for “additional RMRI proposal areas” in the left-hand column to include all the additional landscapes that submitted a proposal but were not selected as priority landscapes. By including a cell for “additional RMRI proposal areas,” there is an opportunity for subcommittees to provide benefits to and support the RMRI proposals that were not prioritized.
- The subcommittees should have a commitment to prioritize their focus to address cross-cutting issues in Southwest Colorado. The subcommittees also should have a commitment to work with the Upper South Platte and Upper Arkansas landscapes to develop local and/or statewide projects to address cross-cutting issues. Because statewide projects

would impact all areas across Colorado, the commitment to work with landscapes to develop local and/or statewide projects should be extended to additional RMRI proposal areas.

- There are remaining questions about whether subcommittees should define their desired outcomes and whether those outcomes are at a state or local level.
- RMRI should have a commitment to connect funding and resources with needs in all three prioritized landscapes (i.e., the matchmaking roles).
- RMRI should have a commitment to extend RMRI communications and branding to all three priority landscapes. The commitment should not extend to the additional RMRI proposal areas at this time.
- The commitments table should be organized to distinguish the commitments being made by the RMRI partners, the operational subcommittees, and the substantives subcommittees.
- Instead of using checkmarks to indicate to which priority landscape RMRI is making certain commitments, they could use colors (e.g., different shades of greens).
- There is a placeholder for the commitments table to be included in the RMRI governance charter. There were differing perspectives on whether the commitments table should be in the governance charter for the full RMRI meeting on June 23. Heather Bergman will create two versions of the commitments table: one with checkmarks and the other with colors. She will send it to the Governance Subcommittee for their review. The commitments table will then be sent to the RMRI partners as a separate document for their review and feedback during the RMRI June 23 meeting. The RMRI partners can provide feedback on whether the commitments table should be in the governance charter.

RMRI PARTNER UPDATE SLIDES DISCUSSION

Meeting participants discussed presentation slides that will be used to update the full RMRI partnership on the Subcommittee's activities. Their comments are summarized below.

- Samuel Wallace and Heather Bergman are creating slides to update the full RMRI group on the activities of the RMRI Governance Subcommittee during the next RMRI meeting on June 23.
- The slides should include the updates to the governance charter, the theory of change diagram, and the commitments table.
- The slides should include the discussion points that the Subcommittee continues to think about (e.g., outcomes versus outputs, the role of RMRI in providing guidance on outcomes, etc.).
- The slides should request RMRI partners to join the Governance Subcommittee and also let priority landscape partners know they can invite subcommittee members to join their meetings.
- Heather Bergman and Samuel Wallace will send the slides for the Governance Subcommittee update during the June 23 full RMRI meeting to the Governance Subcommittee for their review before they are sent out to the full RMRI group.

NEXT STEPS

The Governance Subcommittee will decide when to meet next based on the feedback from the RMRI partners during the June 23 meeting.