

## **HB 5066 Work Group Coordinating Committee Meeting #2**

### **April 22, 2022 Summary Notes**

Coordinating Committee (CC) members present: Caylin Barter, Mary Anne Cooper, Oriana Magnera, Margaret Magruder, Holly Mondo, Kimberley Priestley, April Snell

(Mary Anne was welcomed as a new CC member.)

Staff/facilitation team: Lili Prah, OWRD; Robin Harkless, Oregon Consensus, Jennah Stillman, Oregon Consensus

### **DRAFT FOR REVIEW**

*The following notes are provided by Oregon Consensus. They are not a verbatim account of the discussion but meant to serve as a tracking and group memory tool. Coordinating Committee members should review and help refine for accuracy as needed.*

Additional participants at CC meetings: The group discussed the request raised by Margaret regarding inviting an additional person from AOC to be present to take notes during the Coordinating Committee meetings and as a way to support her, recognizing that she is representing a broad constituency on behalf of AOC and on behalf of Columbia County.

A lengthy discussion ensued with no clear agreement on how to proceed. Considerations and concerns raised were a desire to provide an accommodation to Margaret to help her track the discussions; concern that having a non-Work Group member present would change the dynamic and potentially tone of the discussions; recognizing a difference between the role of an AOC policy person (County Solutions Director) vs a Columbia County staff person present to take notes; and the late notice of the accommodation request to the CC. It was clarified that the concerns being raised were process related to whether expanding the attendee list beyond Work Group members would support the Coordinating Committee's ability to function and be a sounding board for the development of agendas for the Work Group. And- as trust is being established, a concern with bringing non-Work Group members into the mix. Still, Margaret raised the concern about transparency and remained uncertain about the rationale behind not including an additional person in the meeting to support her. Some felt this was not an issue; others voiced concerns. The group agreed that it was important to have someone taking notes. For today and ongoing, Jennah (OC) and Lili (WRD) will capture the conversation and action items and make sure those are distributed in a timely manner for tracking purposes. Jennah thanked Margaret for her helpful feedback on the last meeting summary which provided some guidance on the level of detail needed for these summaries.

Margaret shared that whatever the will of the Coordinating Committee was, that she would support that direction, but indicated she still was unclear and uncomfortable with the push back. Robin shared that she would follow-up with Andy Smith, County Solutions Director who was intending to be the note taker for Margaret, after this call.

CC member options and comments included:

- Test it out for today's meeting, if CC feels that it hinders the ability for constructive progress, can revisit for next time?
- Since there was enough discomfort voiced, and because we have two note-takers available, there should not be any extras invited in for today.
- The request for accommodation should be met.
- Acknowledged concerns on both sides.
- Some did not have an opinion about this.
- Commit to taking detailed notes and sending them within a short time frame following a meeting.

The group reviewed the purpose and function of the CC for this process, and it was clarified/agreed that they are a smaller coordinating group, not a decision-making group, to allow the full WG to focus on substantive issues. As such, they should show up as individuals (not representatives of their respective entities) to help inform and promote a constructive process of the larger Work Group. The group also discussed that attendance by alternates would not support the work of the Coordinating Committee, and if consistent attendance becomes a concern, the CC may need to recruit additional members.

Related to WG Member attendance: The question of whether to allow alternates into the Work Group space was raised, and whether they would have the opportunity to weigh-in during the substantive discussion. There were different ideas about this, but ultimately the group determined that it was not a pertinent topic to cover today. (*Facilitator's Note: The Work group can revisit this as need arises and as they move more into deliberative space together. They may need to address this concern for the June meeting if alternates are requested to be present.*)

Work Group Charge and proposed path ahead: The group reviewed the proposed agenda for the May 3rd Work Group meeting. Robin shared that based on the direction from the WG, there is a desire for people to identify their needs and interests by digging into specific concepts. It has been affirmed that one size does not fit all for planning approaches, but there are foundational elements that need to show up in every endeavor. Iteratively affirmed through multiple forums (IWRS, 100 Year Water Vision, PBP Guidelines, and OC Assessment) and articulated by the Work Group input to date, the OC team worked to distill these 'essential ingredients' that all planning efforts should have. Intent to confirm with the WG that these are indeed 'essential elements,' add to the list as needed, and then engage on those elements that need more definition or clarity, and discussion around roles and responsibilities between a group and the state for shared ownership and efficacy. This will lead into a path of discourse and lead to recommendations to the state, but the ultimate forum is yet to be determined. Approach for May is to confirm that the 'essential elements' are correct to provide a foundational platform, acknowledging that more definition is needed.

Comments/questions/suggestions:

- For now, remove the 'identify policy gap' task as it is not yet assumed to be a specific output of this group.
- Question about what the definition of 'essential elements' is. Robin shared that the WG would clarify and confirm this list as a starting place, and then dig into adding to and defining these. The 'essential elements' have been articulated in the past forums/work/product iterations as well as work group inputs to date so it does not need to be a blank template to start the conversation.
- One member acknowledged that PBP is set to expire and that this is a policy gap. Not clear what the role of the WG is with the OWRD LC placeholder concept, and whether it will be informed

through this process or another one. In response, Robin shared that OWRD intends to address this topic during the next meeting. Acknowledged the two parallel processes with obvious overlaps.

- Another member acknowledged that the phrase ‘place-based planning’ holds a particular connotation for some (from the pilot program) and would prefer to use the language from HB 5006, “water region or basin level” to avoid potential confusion. Not opposed to building upon the PBP and informing that next iteration, but is not yet known and don’t want to assume it is the only model from which to draw.
- Another member shared that ‘accountability and implementability’ include clarifying next steps of planning efforts. The group noted that defining ‘accountability’ (e.g. implementable, funded, continuity of participants, etc.) will be an important item to better define.
- Robin shared that in exploring and defining the ‘essential elements’ form and function/roles and responsibilities, topics will emerge that have been voiced as big questions by the Work Group: What does state-support mean? What does water region or basin mean? How to know if a plan will get implemented? What is the role of regional planning and what is the baseline of those efforts?
- One member added a language suggestion regarding the roles of a group and the state to not be an either/or. (Remove ‘vs.’ and insert ‘and’.)
- Suggestion to include the reference of which documents and where each element was included as referenced (100 Year Water Vision, IWRS, etc). *Facilitator’s note: All elements show up in all reference documents in some way. The doc will be clearer about this point.*
- We also heard that planning requires a substantial amount of resources and time- where does ‘continuity’ and ‘resource’ show up in these elements? Robin - both issues could be defining characteristics for one or more of the essential elements and the roles and responsibilities discussions, worth bringing to the Work Group for discussion.
- Robin acknowledged that given the CC feedback, it sounds like the topic of ‘accountability’ is rising to the top and may be ripe for the work group’s first discussion.
- One member shared it might be good to delve into a discussion of how the state can assess and/or help with planning readiness. Including helping basins across the state understand what they have, what is missing, how we fill the gaps, potential barriers, etc. Another added: How to build and support the capacity necessary for planning and implementation? *Facilitator’s note: this could be part of the ‘planning and coordination capacity’ element discussion? And/or ‘foundational information’ element discussion?*
- Suggestion that not all elements (and sub elements) may need to be defined. Perhaps the group starts with a broader question of ‘Which of these elements needs to be more clearly defined?’
- Suggested refinements will be incorporated into the next iteration of the documents reviewed, and shared with the Work Group.

It is recognized that there have been so many planning efforts that have seemingly occurred in silos almost. But we are trying to bring all those elements together and strengthen the outcomes of all those separate planning endeavors.

Proposed timeline for the Work Group. Robin reviewed the May through December timeline noting it is subject to change based on the needs of the group. OC will work with the CC to put more detail into the June meeting planning, after the May meeting. For now, she thanked the group for their helpful contributions to shaping the May agenda and general articulation of the group’s charge.

Ongoing learning process: Robin shared the intent to provide opportunities in-between meetings for continued learning spaces where people can learn about specific topics to free up some of the work group time for more direct engagement with each other, a desire that has been voiced by Work Group members. These would be recorded so Work Group members can either attend and participate in Q&A real time or watch later. Some ideas are more grassroots examples of regional planning and examples from other states. The June meeting would be a deeper dive, in person, 10am-3pm to continue conversation around essential elements: clarity and definition; and generating ideas for what gaps need to be filled to support these elements in regional planning across the state. Some discreet task group needs may emerge from this, to craft ideas or proposals (e.g. Best practice? Template? Specific requirement?) around some of these definitions.