Under all options, any member of the public is welcome to join calls or meetings and are welcome to participate in discussions. However, they are not official members or advisors unless otherwise noted.

***Option 1: Broad Consensus\* (up to 43 members possible)***

* Members from each signatory (two each)
* One member from each WQGIT workgroup (invited)
* One member from each CBP Advisory Committee (invited)
* At-large Members\*\*
  + Maximum 10

\*Decision-making for the WQGIT will be done through a unanimous or consensus-based process (e.g. all parties can live with the decision) that ultimately concludes in the polling of members to determine the will of the group. If, after substantial negotiations, consensus cannot be reached, all WQGIT members will be polled, and the decision will be elevated to the next decision-making body along with a description of the positions of the polled members.

\*\*Criteria for At-Large Membership: In an effort to empower non-signatory partners in the decision-making process, priority for at-large membership will be reserved for nongovernmental organizations, quasi-governmental organizations, Federal Agencies, academic institutions, and other local practitioners[[1]](#footnote-1) that have a role in water quality improvements. Nominations will be accepted from all WQGIT members and interested parties and the selection of the at-large membership will be determined by the signatory WQGIT members with consideration to their level of commitment, skills and perspectives (e.g., geographic diversity and expertise).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Pros** | **Cons** |
| Maximum inclusiveness | May be difficult to build consensus |
| Egalitarian - Each member has equal input | Large group is difficult to coordinate |
| Most like current structure | Meetings require larger rooms, more resources |
| Allows for non-signatories to participate in decision making; helps ensure greater buy-in to decisions |  |
| Provides a way to add new members |  |

***Option 2: Member Consensus\* with advisors (up to 28 members and 15 advisors possible)***

* Members from each signatory (two each)
* At-large Members\*\*
  + Maximum 10
* One advisor\*\*\* from each WQGIT Workgroup (invited)
* One advisor from each CBP Advisory Committee (invited)

\*Decision-making for the WQGIT will be done by signatory and at-large members through a unanimous or consensus-based process (e.g. all parties can live with the decision) that ultimately concludes in the polling of members to determine the will of the group. If, after substantial negotiations, consensus cannot be reached, WQGIT members will be polled, and the decision will be elevated to the next decision-making body along with a description of the positions of the polled members.

\*\*Criteria for At-Large Membership: In an effort to empower non-signatory partners in the decision-making process, priority for at-large membership will be reserved for nongovernmental organizations, quasi-governmental organizations, Federal Agencies, academic institutions, and other local practitioners that have a role in water quality improvements. Nominations will be accepted from all WQGIT members, advisors, and interested parties, and the selection of the at-large membership will be determined by the signatory WQGIT members with consideration to their level of commitment, skills and perspectives (e.g., geographic diversity and expertise).

\*\*\*Advisors actively participate in the conference calls and meetings and provide their review and comment on the issues under discussion, including those for decision. Advisors do not serve as official members of the WQGIT. Although consensus will not be sought from advisors, their input will be solicited throughout the decision making process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Pros** | **Cons** |
| Still promotes inclusiveness through at-large membership | May be difficult to build consensus |
| Provides a way to add new members | Large group is difficult to coordinate |
| Allows for non-signatories to participate in decision making; helps ensure greater buy-in to decisions | Meetings require larger rooms, more resources |

***NEW Option 3: Broad and Signatory Consensus\* (up to 29 members possible)***

* Members from each signatory (one each with an alternate identified) (9)
* At-large Members\*\* (one each with option to identify an alternate) (up to 6)[[2]](#footnote-2)
* One advisor\*\*\* from each WQGIT Workgroup (invited) (11)[[3]](#footnote-3)
* One advisor from each CBP Advisory Committee (invited) (3)

\*Decision-making for the WQGIT will be done by signatory and at-large members through a unanimous or consensus-based process (e.g. all parties can live with the decision) that ultimately concludes in the polling of members to determine the will of the group. If, after substantial negotiations, consensus cannot be reached within the broader membership, consensus will be sought from the signatory members, particularly on those issues that are deemed time-sensitive by the CBP partnership. In those time-sensitive instances, the WQGIT agenda will clearly note those decisions where consensus will be sought from the signatory members[[4]](#footnote-4) if broader consensus cannot be achieved. If consensus still cannot be reached at the signatory stage, all WQGIT members will be polled, and the decision will be elevated to the next decision-making body along with a description of the positions of the polled members.

\*\*Criteria for At-Large Membership: In an effort to empower non-signatory partners in the decision-making process, priority for at-large membership will be reserved for nongovernmental organizations, quasi-governmental organizations, Federal Agencies, academic institutions, and other local practitioners[[5]](#footnote-5) that have a role in water quality improvements. Nominations will be accepted from all WQGIT members, advisors, and interested parties, and the selection of the at-large membership will be determined by the signatory WQGIT members with consideration to their level of commitment, skills and perspectives (e.g., geographic diversity and expertise).

\*\*\*Advisors actively participate in the conference calls and meetings and provide their review and comment on the issues under discussion, including those for decision. Advisors do not serve as official members of the WQGIT. Although consensus will not be sought from advisors, their input will be solicited throughout the decision making process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Pros** | **Cons** |
| Maximum inclusiveness | May be difficult to build consensus |
| Egalitarian - Each member has equal input | Large group is difficult to coordinate |
| Most like current structure | Meetings require larger rooms, more resources |
| Allows for non-signatories to participate in decision making; helps ensure greater buy-in to decisions |  |
| Provides a mechanism to achieve closure on decisions if consensus cannot be achieved by broader membership |  |
| Decisions made by those most affected |  |
| Provides a way to add new members |  |

1. Local practitioner is defined in this context as a person with practical, real-world implementation expertise who will provide this perspective to the GIT. Examples include but are not limited to a public works director, soil and water conservation specialist, or municipal engineer. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The number of at-large members may fluctuate based on interest. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Workgroups include: Agriculture; Federal Facilities; Forestry; Land Use; Milestones; Modeling (part of STAR but affiliated with WQGIT as part of midpoint assessment); Toxic Contaminants; Trading and Offsets; Urban Stormwater; Wastewater Treatment; and Watershed Technical. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The Federal members will act as a delegation if a polling of the signatory members is required. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Local practitioner is defined in this context as a person with practical, real-world implementation expertise who will provide this perspective to the GIT. Examples include but are not limited to a public works director, soil and water conservation specialist, or municipal engineer. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)