

**Metro DNA Steering Committee**  
**Notes from August 10, 2016**  
The Denver Zoo

1. Attendees

Name	Organization	Status
Alyssa Von Lehman Lopez	Denver Museum of Nature & Science	
Brian Aucone	Denver Zoo	present
Brian Kurzell	National Wildlife Federation	present
Emily Patterson	The Trust for Public Land	present
Graeme Patterson	Denver Zoo	
Heidi Sherk	The Nature Conservancy	
Mary Hacking	Denver Museum of Nature & Science	present
Bryce Snellgrove	Denver Museum of Nature & Science	present
Jennifer Grace-Ewa	University of Denver	
Jennifer Henderson	Denver Zoo	present
Jennifer Riley-Chetwynd	Denver Botanic Gardens	present
Jim Petterson	The Trust for Public Land	
Luann Rudolph	The Nature Conservancy	
Missy Davis	The Nature Conservancy	
Olga Gonzalez	LiveWell Colorado	present
Leslie Pickard	Boys and Girls Club	present
Stephanie Stowell	Denver Zoo	present
Susan Daggett	University of Denver	present
Tim Wohlgenant	The Trust for Public Land	
Tina Martinez	Boys and Girls Club	
Bill Fulton	The Civic Canopy	present
Ana Soler	The Civic Canopy	
Emily Holcomb	The Civic Canopy	present

**2. DU Presentation on preliminary findings from other Collective Impact efforts**

Susan and two of her graduate students presented an overview of their initial research on 4 peer efforts at nature-based collective impact. Key points from the presentation follow.

- a. Four Nature Alliance organizations: Lessons Learned
  - i. organizations
    1. Bay Area Open Space Council
    2. Chicago Wilderness
      - a. Learning they need more focus, learned from Portland
    3. The InterTwine (Portland)
      - a. Puts people first!
      - b. Call themselves “the Public Radio” here to serve partners, paid by public dues.
    4. Regional Open Space Strategy (ROSS)
  - ii. Multi-dimensional, multi-stakeholder, multi-regional, multi issues – yet connected
  - iii. Different focuses, some put nature first, some people first

- iv. Constantly adapting
- b. Value propositions
  - i. Changing over time
- c. Themes
  - i. Communication is key in maintaining viability of backbone organization
    - 1. Internally with staff and partners (calendar, listserv, newsletters, etc) and externally with network (website, social media).
    - 2. Commonalities
      - a. All have social media programs – integrated and have 1 staff member in charge of communication
      - b. Engages members on these platforms
      - c. Regular summits, working groups, symposiums (regular connections) – emphasize the importance of Face to Face
    - 3. Differences
      - a. Ad campaigns
      - b. Chicago wilderness uses “Yourmembership.com” to connect partners.
  - ii. Partners lead projects, organizations guide and provide connections
  - iii. Must have funding plan – need multiple sources.
    - 1. Many different models:
      - a. Membership dues/individual donors
      - b. Partnership dues
      - c. Philanthropic funding
      - d. Corporate sponsorship
      - e. Federal grants
    - 2. Funding – around \$500,000 budgets with many funding sources, typically around 5 staff members
  - iv. 501c(3) model
    - 1. All except ROSS
  - v. Uniting together under one vision/common catalysts
    - 1. Regional challenges, climate change, inadequate or absent funding, diversity, fragmented approach to addressing multi stakeholder issues, etc.
- d. Areas of Concern
  - i. Over reliance on federal or philanthropic funding
  - ii. Convening is not enough – need for communication
  - iii. Partners should lead in order to reduce competition
  - iv. How do you define a project and branding?
  - v. Need for tracking and aggregation of data
  - vi. Inclusivity and multiculturalism is not automatic
- e. Mixed results
  - i. None yet understand how to successfully use data to measure success
  - ii. Project declaration process—what counts as a project of the initiative, vs. an individual project of members?

- iii. Authority of and engagement with regional government - need buy in
- iv. Membership engagement
- v. Geographic scope/definition of boundaries
- vi. Branding of projects
- vii. Role of membership agreement
- f. End of the day: comes down to funding
  - i. Chicago had to reorganize from scratch because of poor funding allocation. Portland started out asking for partner funds – simplistic and sustainable.
- g. Questions
  - i. Curious how partners might reflect on the experience of partnering with these organizations?
  - ii. What did the organizations do to attract partners to them?
    - 1. Each put together a regional plan which got partners interested
    - 2. Ballot measure to increase resources (InterTwine) – Portland has a regional government so they can implement through the govt.
      - a. Most don't have the capacity to support these plans
    - 3. All reflect the importance of leadership – someone who is high profile, who can bring people to the table, provide “gravitas” that engages community initially.

### 3. Next Events – August 24<sup>th</sup> and Sept 8<sup>th</sup>

The group discussed two upcoming outreach meetings and how to best prepare for them. While they have different purposes and different invitation lists, they also overlap and are part of a general outreach effort so need to be connected.

- a. Susan mentioned an opportunity to engage professors within DU through a funding opportunity at the university– there probably is more expertise, but how to engage?
  - i. Internal RFP? Focus on people to support the 8<sup>th</sup> meeting (data, research, evaluation). **Group is interested in pursuing.**
- b. Emily reached out to Jake and Jackie at GOCO – will attend both meetings and are available Monday at 2:30 for a meeting
- c. August 24<sup>th</sup> meeting
  - i. Goal to get feedback on mission, vision, values, and outcome areas, plus equity
  - ii. Presentations of material? Who will lead:
    - 1. Small group to connect before
      - a. Susan, Jennifer, Stephanie
  - iii. Need to review context
    - 1. Language matters – need to be consistent. This is a “Partner Driven” effort, mDNA provides support for their goals.
    - 2. Pull feedback from exercises at the January GOCO event to frame this
    - 3. Start with “Why” are we here, and “So What”
  - iv. Equity
    - 1. Need someone to explain each lens through equity
  - v. Invites
    - 1. All hubs
    - 2. Make sure to connect out to multiple people

3. Invite list out on google docs, people “own” different invitations—each person trying to reach 2 additional people to invite
- vi. Venue at Zoo – Gates building
  1. Zoo folks will send information
  2. Need decision made for room set up
  3. Catering – water and coffee. No lunch. Let them know Samburu Grill is open at the zoo
- d. September 8<sup>th</sup> 9am – 12 pm meeting. Data focused
  - i. Venue
    1. DMNS
    2. Catering – water and coffee. No lunch.
  - ii. Bob Hurer
    1. Demonstrating portals from TPL, what they can offer
    2. Team to develop agenda: Emily, Susan, Brian
  - iii. Group agrees that shared goals and measurement should help drive the collective action, rather than being an afterthought, so agenda will focus on reaching agreement on the shared outcomes and indicators that matter most
  - iv. Discussion around how to share/interact with data
  - v. Conversation about future Scope of Work (what exists, whats needed)
    1. Conservation vision as next step – introduce potential to develop a regional conservational plan

#### 4. Survey

The Denver Zoo team is developing a survey to share with stakeholders to get their feedback on how Metro DNA is framing its purpose, goals, and process. They shared a draft of the survey and asked for feedback.

- a. Purpose: Get feedback from broad audience and those who cannot attend meetings
  - i. How does mDNA connect to goals of their organization? How does the language and messaging and mission/vision resonate with you?
- b. Agreement: Let’s wait to send out survey until after August 24<sup>th</sup> meeting
  - i. We can use meeting discussion to refine the survey
  - ii. This will be a way to follow up with those who didn’t attend in a more targeted way
- c. Survey Check
  - i. Need to include Equity Bucket – intentionally as it is not its own bucket but a focus/lens. Each indicator needs to be viewed through equity lens (provide our definition – equity does not mean equality). Need someone to explain each lens through equity
  - ii. Vision mission values question
    1. Do we really want to ask if people want to make changes? Do we really want to make those changes?
      - a. Instead: what questions do you have about the above (not what changes do we make)
      - b. Space for expressing concern, but not space for making drastic changes

iii. A lot of open ended questions – reduce to simplify?

1. Make more on a Likert scale, then at end of section space to respond.

2. Make a good balance between rich answers and desire to answer

d. Can core team stay for an additional hour after the meeting on the 24<sup>th</sup> to process and reflect on the discussion?

#### 5. Review of Stakeholder Engagement

Jennifer Riley-Chetwynd and Ana Soler met recently to review the lessons from the initial stakeholder outreach interviews and focus groups to make sure to keep applying the lessons learned from those discussions. Jennifer highlighted some of the takeaways from that discussion.

- a. Consistent them of including young adults
- b. Collective impact – Theory vs Practice, make sure this is “real”
- c. Financial structure – concerns about Metro DNA competing with other orgs. over funding—need to make sure this concern is addressed
- d. Collaboration/meeting fatigue – “right way” to communicate
  - i. Partners as customers?
  - ii. What services could this regional organization provide?

#### 6. MOU Update

Emily shared an update on the current status of the internal Metro DNA MOU.

- a. Signed by DU
- b. Passing signature document around to other organizations to sign

#### 7. Scope of Work for Strategic Planning Consultant

Emily shared an update about the current status of the work group developing the scope of work for a strategic planning consultant, to be hired in January.

- a. SoW- best approach is doing an RFQ, hoping to identify a broad range of talented consultant. Release ASAP – September 1<sup>st</sup>?
- b. Emily needs help collecting work done up to date to attach to the RFQ to highlight what Metro DNA is up to
- c. Emily will ask for input on where to publish

#### 8. Story Capture

- a. Has begun, stories are being collected!

#### 9. Next Steps

- a. Future agenda items
  - i. Apply DU lessons to our planning process – deeper conversation around their study once final report is done
- b. Survey
  - i. Send to people who don’t attend meeting after the meeting on the 24<sup>th</sup>
- c. How do we get data driven work & collective impact focus from the beginning?
  - i. Chicago basically has created 6 different groups to address multiple issues. Fractured, under the same umbrella.
  - ii. If we want to treat this as collective impact, we should identify a couple projects we can measure and drive change on. Others, we can drive communications on but not be as intentional or supportive towards.
    - 1. Bill – sees action items (3) as very measurable (access, quality,

- a. Emily – look for projects that provide multiple benefits across 3 areas.
- d. Emily – Bob let her know that if we start in September on analysis and mapping exercise, he should have something initially in November. However, the Scope of Work initially based on the assumption that some costs could be covered by an overlap with another regional project. That project is now focused only on Denver County, not the region, so there is not longer the same cost sharing opportunity. As a result, the costs of the GIS Mapping are likely to go up.