

HB 5006 Work Group Coordinating Committee Meeting June 21, 2022 Summary Notes

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

Staff and Facilitation Team: Lili Prah, OWRD; Robin Harkless, Oregon Consensus; Jennah Stillman, Oregon Consensus

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.

ACTION ITEMS:

- OC will develop a synthesis of the June workshop small group notes to show the through line from that work to the tasks articulated in the survey and prioritized for work over the next few months. This will be sent to the full work group, with an invitation for anyone to flag additional major issues that may not be encompassed within the current task approach, and to indicate if they are interested in participating on a task group.
- CC (**if time and desire**) can review an original draft of the survey tasks to determine if anything that may be deemed an important priority by the work group was not included, or was mischaracterized in the current Task Approach document.
- OC will send an email to those who signed up for task work to begin scheduling and organizing. For each task, OC will work with OWRD and the interested work group task members to develop an agenda and timeline. This will be distributed to the full work group, to allow any interested work group member to join the task work efforts along the way, as time and desire permits.
- OWRD will begin developing a starter document for each task, and determine what resources may need to be brought in to support efforts. They may ask task groups for input on this as well.
- OC will develop a proposed outline of the work group's decision-making path and schedule going forward. It will include task work, full work group deliberations, decision points, and a process for any additional proposals that work group members want to bring forward for consideration by the full work group. It will include a stepwise approach to moving substance forward that is iterative and allows for major concerns to be flagged at the earliest point possible. This will be shared with the CC, and then the full work group.
- Following this, OC will send an email to the full work group to again communicate the process, work, who will be involved in each task group, and once known, schedule of task group meetings to allow for work group members to join the efforts along the way as individual work group member time and desire permits. The communication will be explicit that all work group members will have an opportunity to weigh-in on draft products iteratively and no recommendations will move forward on behalf of the group without a consensus check/approval of the full group.

- OC will use a DoodlePoll to schedule meetings with the CC for the next few months.

PROCESS AGREEMENTS:

- Generally, the CC signaled support for OWRD holding the pen on initial drafts of products for each task group, and recruiting additional outside resources as needed to support the work. IF a major resource need is identified, this will be brought back to the CC to determine a course of action. There were two exceptions to OWRD holding the initial pen:
 - ‘Updated and Integrated Data for Regional Water Planning’ will be led by DEQ.
 - ‘Public and Community Engagement Guidelines’ will require outside expertise, so that task will begin with a request to the work group volunteers about where to find good resources and potentially, who to invite in to assist or lead this piece.
- The CC agreed that a clear process for decision-making should be mapped out going forward. To date, few ‘decisions’ have had to be made and as such, the group is unclear about what this process will look like. As the work group enters this next phase of options development, deliberation, converging on agreements, a clear approach will be needed.
- The CC agreed that more time is needed for CC to be able to provide adequate feedback on proposed work group processes. The CC and the OC/OWRD staff team need to get to a better place in this partnership in this regard. *Facilitator’s Note: The intersection of process and substance is challenging in this space (as one CC member pointed out) and therefore clarifying expectations and having good communication within the CC advisory process is critically important.*
- The CC discussed some of the challenges that have continued the atmosphere of uncertainty, including: lack of clear direction from HB 5006, no explicit leader to drive the charge or substance, no clear audience for recommendations, and the general nature of the water space being very political, nebulous and contentious. Tightening up the process approach and having clear documentation of substantive through lines, as well as enough support to OWRD to build initial products, should in part alleviate some of the uncertainty.

DISCUSSION SUMMARY

1. Review survey results

- The survey yielded a 70% work group member response.
- Initial feedback on the survey acknowledged that two of the original task topics got removed. Some CC members expressed that there may have been good content but because they were given only one day to offer feedback, OC may have removed topics too hastily based on initial feedback, instead of allowing time for CC to help reframe questions. The group wondered: Did we answer the questions we set out to ask? (*Note for tracking purposes: The topics a few CC members suggested removing or reframing were related to Continuity and Interagency Coordination - these could be brought back forward if they are deemed important and are not addressed in current product development efforts. OC will acknowledge these topics and invite Work Group members to consider if we missed anything they deem important for consideration.*)
- Some CC members expressed frustration with the short time frame they were given to review and offer assistance on the survey OC sent out. They also didn't see a synthesis of the small and large group discussions that informed the survey draft and as a result, were

concerned that some items may have been taken off the survey or needed better framing. It also raised an overall question about how items get added to process documents, agendas, and the survey, and a need for clearer through lines to show the informing work.

- Action: OC will send the original survey and CC members can flag any issues / framing that got removed they feel should be back on the table to represent the collective work group's discussions. OC will also double check the notes from the small and large group discussions to determine if anything got potentially missed.

2. Feedback on a process approach to moving the work forward over the next two months

- Some CC members expressed a desire/need to see a clear process for how substantive items get on the list or on paper in this next phase of the process.
 - In addition to the consensus tool the group will eventually utilize for determining recommendations going forward from this process, a tool and path to help get there is needed.
 - If a topic has not been prioritized in the current task list, can a work group member(s) develop a proposal for the work group to consider? CC suggested that if space is made for this, there also needs to be an explicit decision point by the full work group about whether to move it forward in concept or eventually, as a work group recommendation.
 - One CC member observed that the work group hadn't had to make decisions yet, so there is uncertainty about when we do come to decision points. Want people to be able to identify red flags before something gets too far along and for the group to say more than 'yes or no' at this point.
- Acknowledgement that one survey doesn't accurately represent people's feelings.
 - Action: To address this in the near term, OC will provide a synthesis document reflecting small group flipchart discussions and large group discussions that teed up the current task work. If something got missed, it can be brought to the work group to determine if it should be added in as a priority issue to work on. Going forward, OC will provide the syntheses of small and large group work within the work group to show the connections and be used to inform the OWRD and task group development of draft products.

3. Proposed approaches for work group task focus review

- General comment: One CC member said - this is a good jumping off point.
- Updated and Integrated Data for Regional Water Planning
 - Questions/Comments - Do we have time to do this? Should the state take a month to develop a document so people have time to absorb and think about it? Perhaps the July meeting could be canceled to allow OWRD to prepare this document?
- Public and Community Engagement Guidelines
 - Comment - HB3293 may be more about projects rather than regional water planning. This task should bring in outside expertise to help develop the product.

(Follow up: OWRD expressed that they see a potential channel for the Work Group effort to inform HB3293 work.)

- Pre-Planning Framework
 - Comment - OWRD should first develop a draft for the small task group to react to.
- The Coordinating Committee members present agreed that they were generally comfortable with OWRD holding the pen and doing work on behalf of the work group at the outset with putting a draft product together for the group to react to (other than the Public and Community Engagement Guidelines - this could be led by those who have expertise in this arena- and Data- this can be led by DEQ).
- One CC member shared that they want OWRD to be able to pull in additional contracted resources/experts to support this work (re: short timeline for completion of Work Group work before year is out, as well as to address fundamental concerns that have been expressed by Work Group members about planning living with OWRD in the long term, and desire that these products are not constrained by what is currently possible at OWRD.) Another member expressed discomfort with bringing in outside expertise without some guidance, and said that if a decision needs to be made about this, it should be brought to the CC (to determine if it needs to go back in front of the whole group for a decision).
 - Generally, the CC was ok with OWRD bringing in resources as needed to support the work, unless a significant resource would be needed in which case it should be brought to the CC to offer guidance on a course of action.
- Important that the work group sees the throughline of where products are coming from (using the meeting summaries and synthesis of flipchart notes). Be clear and document each task effort's inputs, schedule, resources, and decision path.
 - OC suggested that by August or early September, draft products for the full work group to respond to and identify areas of alignment or divergence/general consensus will be the target, and offer a choice point for the work group to determine which items go in to the 'alignment' bucket, which deserve more attention and as such will go in to another iterative round of refinement, and which should be removed from consideration at that juncture.
- Question- what would the commitment for task group work look like?
 - Communication via the survey estimated about 10 hours of time for each task. Each task effort may look slightly different. OWRD and OC will develop a work plan for each and share it within the next week or so.
- There was an acknowledgement that the final work products are not yet known, and will depend on the task work that moves forward and the work group's direction on the intended audience or outcome.

FUTURE CC TOPICS

- **Discuss broader engagement with the public in this effort**
 - On what? When? Format?
 - Are there opportunities that you think are important for this work group to consider engaging with?