

Basin Roundtable Project Exploration Committee: Flaming Gorge
December 13, 2011 – 12pm to 5pm
Hampton Inn; Glendale, CO
FINAL Meeting Summary

Attendees

Gary Barber
Janet Bell
Rick Brinkman
Eric Hecox
Betty Konarski

Kevin McBride
Mel Rettig
Ken Spann
Carl Trick
Kai Turner

Bruce Whitehead
Eric Wilkinson
Jim Yahn

Facilitation Team

Heather Bergman and Mikaela Gregg, Peak Facilitation Group

Welcome and Introductions

Facilitator Heather Bergman opened the meeting by outlining the meeting objectives and agenda. Committee members took a few minutes to introduce themselves and provide a brief outline of their respective backgrounds.

Meeting Objectives

- Get to know the members of the Committee
- Agree on approach for filling remaining seats for environmental, agriculture, and recreation representatives
- Agree on preliminary protocols
- Review preliminary list of issues and interests and agree on approach for getting roundtable, Interbasin Compact Committee (IBCC), and other stakeholder feedback
- Agree on meeting schedule through June

Brief Summary of Background

Heather provided the Committee with a brief summary of the Flaming Gorge Task Force Situation Assessment, the development of the Basin Roundtable Project Exploration Committee, and the approval of the Colorado Water Conservation Board for the final scope of work for this project.

The Arkansas Basin Roundtable initiated a Water Supply Reserve Account grant for an assessment project to look at whether or not there should be a stakeholder dialogue about a possible Flaming Gorge project. The consultants contracted for the assessment interviewed a diverse group of stakeholders and offered an online survey asking a series of questions regarding the pros and cons of having an organized dialogue about a Flaming Gorge project.

One of the critical questions asked was how a possible dialogue would fit in with all the other efforts occurring around the state. While the vast majority of stakeholders said yes, there should be a dialogue, there was substantial variation of opinion regarding what entity should lead/house the dialogue, how it should be organized, who should be engaged, etc. Therefore, the final assessment report made the recommendation for a free-standing dialogue, independent of both the Interbasin Compact Committee (IBCC) and the Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB). The final deliverable of the assessment project was to convene a preliminary meeting to further frame the process. This meeting was held in June 2011. At this meeting, the group determined that the Flaming Gorge dialogue should be based in the basin roundtable process and benefit from the local water knowledge and diverse perspectives that process provides. The preliminary meeting also resulted in a decision to engage environmental, recreational, and agricultural stakeholders, but the group did not have the opportunity to determine how

these seats should be filled. That task now lies with the Basin Roundtable Project Exploration Committee (see below).

Project Scope of Work

The scope of work for the Committee has been modified from the original grant application in order to meet the CWCB's request for a reduced project budget. It is important to recognize that this project is a pilot process using the topic of Flaming Gorge to assess whether a roundtable-based dialogue is a productive approach for discussing new supply projects. The following outlines the current scope of work and set of outcomes to be achieved by the Committee.

Task 1: Identification of Interests and Issues

Develop a preliminary list of interests and issues using SWSI 2010 and information gathered for the Flaming Gorge Task Force Situation Assessment as a starting point for IBCC and BRT discussion and additional contribution

Task 2: Exploration of Current State of Knowledge Regarding Interests and Issues

Discuss and prioritize the preliminary list of interest and issues and explore existing resources in order to outline the range of perspectives/conclusions about a Flaming Gorge project and develop a collective statement regarding what is currently known

Task 3: Exploration of What Would Be Needed to Address Interests and Issues

Discuss what would be needed (including additional work) to address interests and issues

Task 4: Process/Dialogue and Assessment

- Evaluate whether or not the process was effective and could/should be used to assess other potential projects
- Form a recommendation regarding next steps for the Committee

Committee Agreement on Process for Today's Meeting

It was recommended that the Committee use consensus as the decision-making process for this meeting. Consensus was defined as reaching agreement that everyone in the group can *live with*; it does not mean that there is unanimous support, but that the group has worked through a process that attempted to address everyone's interests and everyone can live with the agreement and agree not to block it. In the event that the Committee cannot reach consensus, the Committee would then use majoritarian voting. Highlights from the Committee's discussion include:

- There is concern regarding the use of a consensus process as this is not a decision-making style used in most political arenas.
- If consensus is used it will be important to try to seek full support for a decision, to address all critical issues that would prevent the Committee from being in full agreement.
- There is concern that while consensus will serve the purpose of today's meeting, future meetings will have more diverse perspectives, nuances, layers, and players and that consensus may not be the most productive and appropriate decision-making tool.
- It is critical that whatever mode of decision making is used be fully transparent and reflective of this process.
- It is important that if consensus cannot be reached, the dissenting opinion(s)/concerns are documented.
- Recommendation for back-up voting structures include:
 - 50% plus 1
 - Super majority—2/3 vote

Committee Agreement: Decision-Making Process for Today's Meeting

The Committee agreed that for today's meeting, consensus would be used as the method of decision making. If consensus cannot be reached, dissenting opinions will be documented and a super-majority vote (2/3 or 9/13 members present) will be required to pass any proposal. All Committee members have an equal, single vote.

Membership

Based on the recommendation from the preliminary meeting in June 2011, the Committee includes up to two seats each for the agricultural, environmental, and recreational communities. The Committee was asked to discuss and agree on whether and how to fill these seats.

General

- There seems to be adequate representation with the current Committee members and therefore there is no need to add specific seats for specific interests.
- There may be a need to reach out to engage representatives from Wyoming and Utah. Additional comments on this topic include:
 - In the original assessment report it was recommended that Wyoming and Utah stakeholders be involved in the dialogue but not as seated members of the group. This approach was retained in the final grant approved by the Colorado Water Conservation Board. However, representatives from Wyoming and Utah can be included in the process in a different capacity (e.g., on a panel, as a resources, etc.).
 - There may be a need to engage these stakeholders after the initial project is completed; it may be something that could be recommended to the CWCB as a next phase.
 - There is concern regarding having seats for/voting rights for other states, but it would be valuable to engage them in the conversation to help the Committee understand the full scope of issues and interests, specifically relating to Wyoming and Utah perspectives.
- There seems to be a need to respond to the concerns and criticism expressed by the environmental community; therefore it may be valuable to have environmental stakeholders represented in order to validate the process, findings, and final work product(s).
- Some BRTs selected their representatives based on the need to ensure balanced representation; other BRTs took a different approach. Some considered geographic representation, while others simply elected those individuals who volunteered.
- It is important to have people at the table who can ask questions and advance the conversation, but not necessarily be the expert for a specific interest and provide the answers. The Committee can invite experts and create panels for presentations and discussions to get expert information or opinion.
- There seems to be a need for representation from water providers.

Agricultural Representation

- Agricultural interests seem to be adequately represented (overall as well as East Slope and West Slope perspectives in particular) with the current Committee membership.
- There seems to be an adequate diversity of people on the Committee who can represent agriculture issues; there does not seem to be a need to identify a representative to specifically and solely serve agriculture interests.
- There are many layers to agricultural interests and, therefore, there may be a need for a little more diversity in the current representation.
- There may be a need to reach out to the primary farm and agriculture groups to invite them to decide if they feel agriculture has balanced representation. If they think not, then they can nominate up to two additional representatives.

Committee Agreement: Agriculture Membership

The Committee will reach out to the Colorado Agricultural Water Alliance (CAWA) (as an overarching organization with representation from the primary farm and agricultural groups in the state) and ask if there is a need for additional agricultural representation on the Committee and if so, for CAWA to provide nominations to fill up to two allotted seats.

Environmental and Recreational Representation

- There is concern that if an invitation is not specifically extended to the environmental community, it could have serious repercussions on this process, the outcomes, and similar processes in the future.
- It has been rumored that even if the Committee was to provide seats to the environmental community, they will not accept. However, this Committee has an obligation to extend a welcoming invitation and allow for environmental stakeholders to determine how they want to respond.
- There would be value in having the two environmental and two recreational seats filled.
- During the BRT representative nomination process, Reed Dils from the Arkansas RT and Ken Neubecker (from the Colorado RT) have both volunteered to serve as environmental representatives.
- There is concern that if all stakeholders are not included in the process, there is a great risk that the process and outcomes could be undone or diminished in the end. This seems to be a conversation that will be valuable for all stakeholders to engage in and for everyone to have the opportunity to learn and discuss the topic with a common purpose.
- There seems to be a need to have all interests represented at the table in order to fulfill the project scope. There may be a need for the Committee to offer invitations and, if the invitations are declined, to ensure all seats are filled through other means.
- It may be most valuable to approach each stakeholder group and ask them if they would like to be engaged and if so, have the group identify/select a representative(s).
- It may be most efficient to work with the list of stakeholders that have volunteered in order to not delay the project timeline.
- There may not be a need to distinguish the recreational stakeholders from the environmental stakeholders.
- There is concern that by engaging non-BRT members to represent the environmental and recreational communities, this conversation may become a BRT versus non-BRT dialogue.
- There seems to be a need to ensure that the recreational community is able to address recreational issues related to water.
- It is most important to ensure that the process, dialogue, and project outcomes have credibility.
- It is important to have diverse representation from all groups.
- It is important to try to ensure that there is balanced East Slope and West Slope representation from the environmental and recreational communities. If this does not seem to be the case, the Committee may need to somehow address this later in the process.

Stakeholder Groups

The committee outlined the following groups as potential resources to contact to help fill the remaining stakeholder seats:

Environmental:

- Southern Rockies Conservation Alliance
- Western Resource Advocates
- The Nature Conservancy
- Colorado Environmental Coalition

- Sierra Club
- Western Colorado Congress

Recreation:

- Trout Unlimited (state and local chapters)
- Ducks Unlimited (state and local chapters)
- The Audubon Society
- American Whitewater
- State or Chamber Tourism Office (as a resource for additional groups)
- Colorado River Outfitters Association

Invitation Process

The Committee discussed how to get nominations from the environmental and recreational communities and invite these stakeholders to the table.

- The process needs to be managed to some degree in order to prevent an overabundance of nominations and unnecessary delays to the project.
- It may be valuable to extend invitations to the key groups and see whether they are interested in participating and then allow those groups to choose their representatives.
- It may be more efficient to ask the environmental and recreational communities each to work together to provide up to two representatives.
- It may be valuable to reach out to a central stakeholder organization and use that entity to help identify representatives whom the Committee could contact and choose from.
- Whatever process is used, in the invitation to participate it needs to be made clear that this is a dialogue-focused process and that no project specific determination or commitment will be made; the focus of this project is the conversation, learning, process, and framework. It is important for this message to be clear so that representatives can be selected accordingly.
- It will also be important to request representatives who are familiar with and ideally have been engaged in dialogues and processes specifically related to water; it is important that all members of the Committee have a similar foundational understanding and level of experience.
- The nomination and selection process, whatever it may be, needs to be open and transparent.

Committee Agreement: Environmental and Recreational Membership

The Committee will send a letter to the environmental and recreational groups identified above inviting them to each nominate up to two representatives to serve on the Committee. Each group of stakeholders (environmental and recreational) will be asked to join a conference call to discuss and develop their representative nominations. Heather will send the invitations and host the conference calls in order to ensure timely nominations and provide a venue for these discussions.

Protocols

The Committee was provided with a list of potential items that could be included in the Committee protocol document (appended to this meeting summary for reference). The Committee was asked to review this list and discuss what elements should be incorporated into a final set of Committee protocols.

Purpose or Goal

The following recommendations were provided on the topic of defining the Committee's purpose and goal:

- Use the heading from the scope of work as a summary of purpose
- Reiterate that this is an information-gathering and exploration process and is in no way a decision-making or commitment-making process
- Outline that if issues come up associated with other projects, they will be addressed to the extent possible and reasonable within the project scope

- Keep the statement of purpose simple and clear

Principles

Agreement: Principles

The Committee agreed to the protocols outlined in the protocol document with the addition of the following suggested items:

- Clarify what “shared education” means, i.e., sharing in the educational process of the group
- Add Committee “exploration” of interests and issues
- Add a focus on “productive discussions”

Membership

The Committee offered the following comments regarding whether or not alternates should be used as backups for Committee members:

- There is concern that alternates may create too big a group and complicate the process.
- If there is a need for alternates, it should be each representative’s responsibility to keep them abreast of all issues and the Committee’s progress.
- For those interest groups only represented by one person, an alternate should be allowed.

Agreement: Membership and Alternates

The Committee agreed that membership will consist of the current list of Committee representatives with the potential for up to two additional representatives to fill the agricultural, environmental, and recreational seats as outlined in the grant application. The Committee also agreed that there will be no alternates for any Committee member and that it will be the responsibility of each representative to attend meetings and engage in this process to the best of his or her ability. If a Committee member is unable to attend a meeting, he or she should communicate this to the facilitator as soon as possible and make appropriate arrangements. Should a Committee member no longer be able to serve on the Committee, it is his or her responsibility to communicate with his/her BRT and for the BRT to appoint a new representative in a timely fashion.

Representation

The Committee discussed whether or not Committee members should wear a specific “hat” and represent a specific affiliation (e.g., BRT, professional title, etc.).

- Each Committee member is here to represent the interests of his/her BRT. Should there be a need to provide a different perspective (e.g., personal, professional, etc.), that should be made clear to the group.
- There is a need to include language in the protocols to highlight that members will also consider a statewide perspective.
- It seems inaccurate to assume that representatives were assigned to specifically represent a particular perspective and/or set of interests. The purpose of this project is to look at a specific topic from statewide perspective.
- It would be valuable to add a statement regarding the Committee’s intent to be open-minded (use “yes if” language) and represent interests in a professional manner.

Agreement: Representation

The Committee agreed that the statement of representation should address the suggestions outlined: Committee members shall represent the ideas, concerns, and perspectives of their BRTs while also exploring issues from a statewide perspective.

Member Responsibilities

Agreement: Member Responsibilities

Committee members agreed with the responsibilities outlined in the protocol handout with the addition of the following suggestions:

- Add to “speak up if in opposition to a proposal” that alternative proposals should be provided
- Add that documents should be reviewed by Committee members in a timely fashion
- Add a statement regarding non-attribution of comments or ideas made during meetings

Subcommittees

Agreement: Subcommittees

The Committee agreed that there will not be a need for development of subcommittees and therefore the topic does not need to be addressed in the protocols.

Decision Making

The Committee discussed the approach to decision making that should be applied throughout the entire project. This discussion built on the previous conversation regarding decision making for the day’s meeting as the Committee was in agreement that a similar structure should be used.

- It may be valuable to include an opportunity for a dissenting party who is not in agreement with the rest of the group to provide a written explanation/rationale to supplement the meeting summary.
- There is concern that if there is an option for a written dissent to be added to the meeting summary it may expand the issue and not provide an opportunity for full discussion of all the issues outlined.
- It would be valuable to allow voting proxy for members unable to attend a meeting or to have the facilitator or another BRT representative allowed to communicate relevant issues and thoughts prior to a decision.

Agreement: Decision Making

As established for this meeting, consensus will be used as the central method of decision making for the entire process. If consensus cannot be reached, dissenting opinions will be documented and a super-majority vote (2/3) will be used. All Committee members have an equal, single vote. Committee members will review meeting summaries for accuracy, specifically regarding dissenting opinions. If additional Committee members have suggested changes to the decision-making structure, they can be discussed and considered at the January meeting.

Agency Roles

The Committee suggested the following be incorporated into the statement of roles:

- The State representative will participate fully on the Committee and provide State information and perspectives where appropriate.
- The State representative, while technically filling three seats provided for State interests, will have only one vote.
- Other states and state agencies are acknowledged as valuable stakeholders to the process. If this ‘outside’ expertise is needed, the Committee will extend invitations as needed and appropriate with the dialogue and scope of work.

Role of Facilitator

The Committee agreed to the recommended list of facilitator roles with the following additional suggestions:

- Provide a meeting summary and deliverables within a reasonable amount of time (2 weeks)

- Manage interim and final grant reporting/logistics
- Provide the Colorado Water Conservation Board and State with a brief summary of Committee work as appropriate/requested
- Provide the State's travel reimbursement information to all Committee members
- Determine if a meeting will be canceled or rescheduled due to weather and notify Committee members in a timely fashion; the decision regarding whether to cancel a meeting or not should be based on whether weather or travel conditions negatively impact more than half the group
- Make a best effort in providing conference call access if needed and where equipment can be provided

Travel

- The Pikes Peak Regional Water Authority (the grant applicant) will process travel reimbursements in accordance with the grant specifications.
- CWCB will allocate travel funds accordingly from the BRT accounts. Up to \$2000 per person for up to 12 meetings is available for BRT representatives. Travel reimbursements for non-BRT members will be drawn from the general project account, with up to \$2000 available for distribution among all 6 non-BRT members for up to 12 meetings. State travel rules and regulations apply.
- While the grant application outlines that meetings will be held along the I-25 and I-70 corridors, if Committee members agree and can find appropriate meeting accommodations, meetings can be held in other areas.

Media Interaction

The Committee discussed whether or not Committee members should communicate with the media and if so, in what capacity.

- There is concern that this is a controversial issue and it will not be productive for the process if the Committee communicates with the media. The final meeting summaries should serve as the acting voice for the proceedings.
- This is a process that is open to the public, therefore there may be value in having Committee members communicate with the media in a direct and professional manner; this may help demonstrate the transparency of the dialogue and mitigate potential misrepresentations and miscommunication by the media and public.
- There is concern that since BRTs will receive updates from their Committee representative(s) at their BRT meetings (which are open to the public), information regarding the dialogue will be public; the focus should therefore be on ensuring common and accurate messaging.
- There is concern that it will be too great a task to attempt to control all media communication.
- It seems to be a reasonable commitment to allow the meeting summaries to 'speak' for the group and allow Committee members to offer individual/personal comments to the media.
- It is important for the Committee to know that the facilitator will speak to the media regarding process but not substance.
- It seems important for the Committee members to make the commitment to share with the group their opinions and thoughts before sharing them with the media; there should be no surprises or information revealed to the press before being addressed with the Committee.
- It may be valuable for Committee members to make an effort not to speak to the press but if they do, to encourage the press to attend the meetings and gather the information first-hand.

Agreement: Media Interaction

Members are free to talk to the press about their own perspectives and the process. Only final meeting summaries "speak" to the perspective of the group. Members will use good judgment regarding what is

communicated and how. Members will also adhere to the Committee protocols (e.g., no attribution of comments to individual, etc.) in all interactions with the press.

Interaction with Other Entities

Agreement: Interaction with Other Entities

Committee members agreed they would not work outside the process to influence outcomes and that any desire/need to coordinate or collaborate with other groups or efforts related to the topic but outside the process would be discussed with the Committee prior to engagement. In addition, the Committee requested that the protocols emphasize the need to coordinate with the IBCC, BRTs, the IBCC New Supply Subcommittee, and CWCB.

Documentation

Agreement: Documentation

The Committee agreed to the protocols outlined with the addition that the facilitator will prepare a summary of next steps and major agreements and provide it to the Committee within two days of the meeting for Committee members to review (within two days) and finalize in order to help guide reports to BRTs and ensure consistent messaging at the BRT meetings.

Public Meetings

The Committee discussed how to ensure that the Committee and the public receive adequate notice of meetings and final documents.

- It would be valuable for the Committee to receive notice/reminders of meetings two weeks prior to the meeting with inclusion of a meeting agenda.
- There may be a need to create a listserv to inform the public of meeting and final documents.

Public Comment:

- It may be valuable to create a system in which public comment is incorporated at the beginning of each meeting; total public comment time should be limited to 15 minutes and allotted to each individual in accordance with the number of participants.
- There may be a need to allow for public comment after each topic/agenda item so that there is an opportunity for the Committee to respond or address the topic if necessary.
- As this process is running on a limited timeline, it will be important for public comment not to interrupt the Committee's progress and learning environment.
- Expert panels incorporated into the meetings should not be expected to respond to questions from the public. The public should reach out to their representative prior to the meeting if they have questions or issues they would like addressed and/or personally reach out to the panel on their own time.

Agreement: Public Meeting and Public Comment

Committee members will receive a meeting reminder and agenda two weeks prior to the meeting. A listserv will be created to provide the public with meeting notices and final documents. Heather will work with Eric Hecox to ensure that roundtable members and other stakeholders are aware of how to get on the email distribution list. Public comment will be allotted during the first and last 10 minutes of each meeting and time allotments per speaker will be at the facilitator's discretion based on the number of individuals present.

Preliminary List of Interests and Issues

The Committee was provided with a draft preliminary list of interests and issues. Because identification and discussion of interest and issues is the central component of the project scope, it is critical that the Committee work to develop a list that is as comprehensive as possible; this process will include gathering input from the IBCC, BRTs, and other stakeholder groups. It was suggested that the Basin Roundtable Statewide Summit planned for March 1, 2012, could serve as a key opportunity for the Committee to gather broad-range feedback and input regarding the preliminary list of interests and issues. The Committee discussed additional options for gathering feedback and developing a comprehensive document.

- There is a need for the Committee to discuss and add to this document prior to having a full discussion about the document at the January meeting. It would be valuable if Committee members could send the facilitator their additions via email prior to the January meeting.
- There is concern that there may not be enough time for the Committee to have the necessary conversation regarding issues and interests prior to the March Summit.
- There is concern that the range of issues and interests is directly affected by the deliverables/structure of the project as the demands on a system will vary accordingly. There may be a need to know more about the project specifics—how it will be used to meet the municipal and industrial gap and the agricultural gap—before the full breadth of interests and issues can be outlined.

Schedule

The Committee was provided with a draft project schedule and was in agreement that it provided a reasonable timeline for the process. Committee members agreed to work with the facilitator via email to identify specific meeting dates through June 2012.

Next Steps

Membership

- Heather will draft emails to invite the environmental, agricultural, and recreation communities to identify up to 2 representatives to sit on the Committee. The Committee will review these via email. These emails will go out the week of December 19, 2011.
- All letters will include a summary of what the Committee is doing and a list of existing members. Each group can either nominate additional members or choose not to do so.
- The agriculture letter will go directly to the Colorado Agricultural Water Alliance.
- Heather will host conference calls for the environmental and recreation communities to use to identify volunteers and select Committee members from among the volunteers. These calls will be held the first week in January and will include those entities identified during the meeting as well as any others that are identified by Committee members before Tuesday, December 20.
- New members will be encouraged to attend the next Committee meeting on January 12.

Protocols

- Heather will draft protocols based on the Committee's discussion at the December 13 meeting. The Committee will review the draft protocols via email. The protocols will become final via email.
- New members may suggest changes to the protocols at the January meeting. If the Committee agrees, the protocols can be amended at that time.
- Heather will draft a letter for CWCB to send to all basin roundtable members informing them that the Committee has begun its work and inviting them to join the email distribution list if they want

to receive agendas and final meeting summaries. Eric Hecox will work with CWCB staff to ensure that the letter is sent.

Preliminary List of Interests and Issues

- Committee members will send Heather any additions they would like to see to the preliminary list of interests and issues by 5 pm on December 21.
- Heather will integrate these changes into the document and redistribute a revised version for the Committee to review two weeks prior to the January meeting (December 29).
- The Committee will finalize the preliminary list at the January meeting and prepare a brief feedback form to provide to roundtable members at upcoming meetings and at the March 1 Statewide Roundtable Summit in Denver.

Schedule

- Heather will send an email to the Committee asking for “black-out” dates in March, April, May, and June in order to get meetings in these months scheduled as soon as possible. There is no meeting in February.
- Committee members will also identify preferences for locations of meetings and provide assistance with identifying venues that are cost-effective, can accommodate a group of 25 with up to 15 observers, and have conference call capacity if needed.
- Heather will work with Eric Hecox to identify the key parameters and variables in the design and intent of a Flaming Gorge project to share with the Committee at the January meeting.

ATTACHMENT
Key Issues for Consideration in Collaborative Group Protocols
Prepared by Peak Facilitation Group

1. Purpose or Goal, Authority of Group
2. Guiding Principles
 - a. Openness
 - b. Open-mindedness
 - c. Transparency
 - d. Shared education
 - e. Civil discourse
3. Membership
 - a. Who are the members?
 - b. Are there alternates?
4. Representation
 - a. Hats on
 - b. Hats off
5. Member Responsibilities
 - a. Abide by the protocols and allow facilitator to enforce them
 - b. Engage in meaningful and productive dialogue
 - c. Actively participate
 - d. Speak up if in opposition to a proposal
 - e. Provide an explanation for all objections
 - f. Avoid destructive language and personal attacks
 - g. Read materials prior to meetings; come prepared
 - h. Be or become knowledgeable about the issue at hand
 - i. Proactively work to keep constituents, colleagues, and managers informed about the work of the group
 - j. Avoid surprises
 - k. Disclose conflicts of interest
 - l. Respect the time of the group; speak briefly and on topic
6. Subcommittees
 - a. Whether or not they can be formed
 - b. Who can join them (members only or others as well)
 - c. Decision making
7. Decision Making
 - a. Impact of group decisions
 - b. How many members must be present for decision making
 - c. If using consensus, a definition, such as “all members can ‘live with’ a proposal
 - d. If using majoritarian voting, specification of what constitutes a majority (50%+1, 2/3, 75%)
 - e. Approach for registering dissent

- f. Approach if consensus cannot be reached and conditions for using this approach
 - g. Whether or not members must be present to participate in decisions (proxies)
 - h. What is required to reopen past decisions
- 8. Agency Roles
 - a. If government entities or staff are participating, what is their role and commitment?
 - b. How does the group's agreement impact agency decisions?
- 9. Role of the Facilitator
 - a. Logistics
 - b. Facilitating meetings to be on point, productive, and on time
 - c. Enforce protocols
 - d. Issue neutrality
 - e. Fair and equal treatment of all participants
 - f. Maintain confidentiality of any discussions with members that are requested to be confidential
 - g. Documentation
 - h. Best effort to incorporate all suggestions for change to draft documents or explanation of why suggestions were not incorporated
- 10. Travel
 - a. Expectations/approach for scheduling meetings (times, locations)
 - b. Protocols for reimbursing participant travel
- 11. Media Interaction
 - a. Whether members can speak to the media
 - b. What members can speak to the media about
- 12. Interaction with Other Entities
 - a. Working outside the group to influence outcomes
 - b. Coordinating or collaborating with other groups or efforts on related topics
- 13. Documentation
 - a. All documents are draft unless labeled "final"
 - b. Draft documents should not be construed as final or distributed outside the Committee unless expressly agreed upon by the group
 - c. All meetings will result in draft summaries circulated to Committee members for review and revision before being finalized
 - d. Time needed for review by Committee members (one week?)
- 14. Public Meetings
 - a. All meetings are public
 - b. What is sufficient notice of time and place of meeting and of agenda?
 - c. What is sufficient format for distribution of this information?