

HB 5006 Work Group Coordinating Committee Meeting July 1, 2022 Summary Notes

Coordinating Committee (CC) members present: Margaret Magruder, Holly Mondo, Kimberley Priestley, Caylin Barter, 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:

- Robin will follow up with Oriana to brief her on the call as it relates to public input in this process as well as ideas for the August Work Group agenda flow.
 - *Follow-up note: Oriana and Robin connected on July 8 and Oriana said she will respond in writing directly to the notes to address specific requests for her feedback identified at the CC call.*
- OC will reach out and invite, again, anyone who did not fill out the survey to highlight anything missing from the body of work being developed for review in August.

Facilitator's note: An invitation to all work group members to identify anything missing will be open after the first review of draft concepts in August and iteratively as products are refined and moving toward consensus check points). One CC member also suggested inquiring if there were barriers to filling out the survey.

 - *Follow-up note: OC reached out directly on July 6 to those who did not fill out the survey and asked if any major topics were missing for directing content development for August and beyond, acknowledgement that the invitation will stay open for feedback along the way, and to share if any barriers to filling out the survey to help make adjustments as needed. OC also conducted another round of outreach the week following. No further feedback was provided.*
- After the next full Work Group meeting, OC will coordinate a subset of Work Group members who have been active on PBP or other regional planning processes to give them a specific opportunity to review draft products through their on the ground lens. This will happen after the full Work Group has an opportunity to review and provide feedback on the first iteration of concepts in August, and will not take the place of full Work Group deliberations.
- OC will check in with the CC after the August meeting to determine if they have new insights or direction around public engagement. Planning for a public forum will need to be intentional and given time for logistics and notifying the public of the opportunity.
- OWRD will develop draft concepts for review in August - if time allows, they will share a preview of a graphic or visual with the CC that they will be using to roll out the concepts, to get some feedback on how accessible/user friendly/ useful it is before sharing it more broadly with the Work Group.

GENERAL CC PROCESS AGREEMENTS:

- CC members present on the call generally agreed to maintain the existing channels for informing the public and creating opportunities on Work Group agendas for the public to provide input to the process. They agreed to retain some flexibility to be responsive to

public desires for input (so far we have not heard a lot of demand from the public) and also to open the space up once draft products are developed and the Work Group is ready and able to receive comments. Since Oriana has been a proponent of community engagement in this process, the CC members agreed to make space for adjustments if she has recommendations.

- CC members present generally agreed that hearing specifically from Work Group members who have on the ground experiences in regional or PBP is critically important to refining concepts and responding to the needs and gaps they have identified. OC should create a channel for this input to draw their voices and expertise in.
- The CC members present generally acknowledged that review of the draft products in August will inform follow-up task work, as well as provide insight into other target audiences they might need to hear from. Work Group members will need to help lead some of the outreach to their constituencies to ensure impacted groups' needs and concerns are brought to bear in the Work Group deliberations and to assist with messaging around ideas.
- The CC members present also acknowledged there may also be a need for establishing a specific forum/ channel / opportunity for broader public engagement and will help advise on this.

DISCUSSION SUMMARY

1. Feedback on public engagement process approach

OC has a placeholder in the process for potentially expanding opportunities for public input into this Work Group process, beyond the window currently set aside on the Work Group meeting agendas. CC members shared their thoughts on the need, approach and timing for public input. Comments are from one or more individuals except where specified:

- It is challenging to do public engagement on such a complex statewide issue, especially without the public knowing exactly what input is wanted from them and without a product from the work group to review and weigh-in on. It is too soon to determine what public engagement is needed in this process. Some members acknowledged that Oriana has been a proponent of this piece of work and would like to hear her input.
 - Action: Robin will connect with Oriana next week around this.
- Perhaps we could use the Public and Community Engagement Task Group's draft guidelines to target feedback from those directly involved with regional planning groups. (PBP pilots, e.g.)
 - One CC member responded that while in principle this is a good idea, practically speaking it might not be good timing because these groups have been tapped a lot for the PBP evaluation and many are focusing now on implementation.
- It will be important to set expectations about what we want from the public and how we will use their input, rather than inviting written comments without any specific channel. One member suggested that the expectation should be "we are open to hearing from the public and we will consider your advice as we engage in deliberations as a work group."
- Different mechanisms/approaches were discussed:

- Specific engagement process for those who have done regional planning to provide feedback. (Lean on the Work Group members who have done regional planning for targeted feedback, rather than reaching more broadly out to PBP groups for the reason articulated earlier in this discussion).
- Create an explicit opportunity for written public comment on draft products, later in the process.
- When there is a product to get public input on, have work group members help lead on messaging to distribute information and requests for feedback from their constituencies.
- To capture public input, include in a summary report of process and outcomes of this work) how input was solicited and what input was received. Show how that input was considered.
- To keep the public informed, do targeted outreach and engagement (CC will discuss after the August meeting informed by the results of that meeting).
- Maintain flexibility to respond and make space as needed for public input. (e.g. if 20 people show up to provide input at a work group meeting, expand the public comment time to hear from them.)
- For now, maintain the various existing channels for the public to be informed and engaged in this effort (e.g. open meetings, recordings, written summaries, public comment period at meetings, access to documents via OWRD's web page).

2. Feedback on draft agenda for August Work Group meeting

- A CC member suggested shifting the public comment period to the beginning of the work group meeting agendas, to signal and manage expectations that it is not intended to weigh-in on the draft products at this point. This was generally agreed to by the CC members present on the call.
- A CC member suggested sequencing the OWRD comprehensive draft concept followed by Public & Community Engagement guidelines with the idea that the latter would nest within the former and make for a better flow of information and deliberation. The CC members present agreed but also suggested following up with Oriana to weigh in.
- Robin will reach out to Oriana next week to convey this idea as well as the general thinking related to public engagement in this Work Group process and relay any feedback that might promote a shift in approach for CC and OC consideration.

3. Feedback on draft concept product development approach

- OWRD and the Public and Community Engagement Task Group via OC will send drafts at least a week in advance of the Work Group meeting. The August meeting will be used to present the drafts and gather feedback from the full Work Group. OC will follow-up with members who have engaged in regional planning (e.g. PBP pilots, Deschutes Basin Collaborative, CRUST, etc.) to get direct feedback through this lens: does the concept reflect the needs they have identified in their experiences? Is it heading in the right direction?
- A visual will be developed to pair with the draft concept developed by OWRD. If it is ready with enough time for review, it will be shared with the CC for initial feedback before the August meeting.