

Notes from 12.03.09 HBMWD Water Resource Planning Advisory Committee

Desired Outcomes

By the end of the meeting, the Water Resource Planning Advisory Committee will have agreements on...

- An agreement on recommended evaluation criteria (done!)
- An agreement on who will present the evaluation to the HBMWD Board on Dec. 10 and how (done)
- Agreement on agenda/design for Water Workshop and on when to conduct second public meeting in Generate Options Phase (to be done via conference call Dec. 7, 9 AM)
- An understanding of what Advisory Committee wants to understand/learn in order to accomplish outcomes of Generate and Evaluate Options Phases ("learning objectives") (to be done via conference call Dec. 7, 9 AM)
- ***An understanding of upcoming outcomes/milestones and an agreement on whether to adjust meeting schedule/length (added Dec. 7 conference call)
- Have provided feedback on how committee/meeting was effective and changes want to make (done)

Update on Action Items

- Glossary of terms is in process. It is being addressed along with the addition of a "preamble" to the evaluation criteria to insure consistency. Jana, Jacqueline, Carol and Pete will have a draft of at least the "preamble" completed by the end of business, Friday, December 4th.
- Sound for the Wharfinger is not yet settled. Pete said he knows of folks who might be able to help. Carol asked him to pass on his contacts to Mary or Carol.
- Kaitlin will complete and send out the Google Calendar in the next days.
- Regarding messages regarding situation in State to be included in the Water Workshop, Carol indicated that these would be included in David Aladjem's and Paula Whelan's presentations.

Agreements

- Refer to the "threshold criteria" as "thresholds" to eliminate implication of weighting found in use of "criteria"
- Do not weight the criteria beneath the "thresholds"
- Explain how criteria will be used, how they were developed, and why the thresholds are thresholds
- Criteria will be used as a guidance document
- All criteria are important as they all came out of the public meetings.
- Include "adaptive management" in a preamble to the evaluation criteria
- In Environmental category
 - Change second item to read "Protect **and** maintain wildlife **and fisheries habitat in the Mad River watershed**"
 - Change third item to "**Enhance** or increase..."
- Move "Generate energy for system use or net sale" from Environmental to District Cost Recovery

- In Access, remove the examples in the 4th item
- Accept proposed separation of Economic Development category into Economic Development and District Cost Recovery
- In Economic Development,
 - Eliminate “industry clusters”
 - Add “entrepreneurship” to item #2 to read “encourage technological innovation and entrepreneurship.”
- In District Cost Recovery
 - Add “utilizes existing industrial system infrastructure”
 - Add “expansion” to “Contribute to covering the District’s costs...”
 - Change second item to read, “Increase District customer base”
 - Change last item to read “Decrease customer rates.”
- In Community Quality of Life,
 - Shorten first item to read “Support and improve community and environment...”
 - Retain “community engagement” (second item)
 - Delete the third item (“Inspire other communities...”)
 - Change the last item to read “Inspire wide-spread community support.”

Feedback on evaluation criteria from Water Task Force

- Overall, the WTF was satisfied with the evaluation criteria
- There were some concerns with the cost of the process versus just finding a new customer
- Weighting criteria is an issue
- Description of threshold vs. other criteria needs clarification
- Appreciated the public meetings
- Recommended eliminating examples listed in the Access threshold, item 4
- Suggested that “adaptive management” is too broad and should be moved
- Noted that description of how the document will be used is needed
- Acknowledgement of indigenous rights is missing
- Clarity of “consensus” needed in the spirit of not setting ourselves up for failure (An AC member suggested changing the word to “understanding?”)
- Quality of life was thought to be too subjective

Feedback on evaluation criteria from municipalities

- Three of the four wanted to see an abbreviated history of the District
- The issue of threshold and ranking/weighting brought up and viewed as a difficult issue overall
- Overall very supportive of work so far

Comments on evaluation criteria in general

- Weighting will keep coming back so we were careful to maintain the same number of items in each category
- Be certain that criteria reflects the public’s input from the meetings and not what’s important to members of the AC

- Don't be worried that the AC is conveying subliminal messages
- Don't think that there's going to be so many viable options that weighting will be an issue. Balance will occur organically
- Appreciative of work done so far
- "Generate energy..." Environmental or Economic?
- Weighting does need to be addressed as it arose at each public meeting
- Splitting Economic Development and District Cost Recovery into two categories is a good idea
- "Energy generation" through hydroelectric is environmental but can see how it also fits elsewhere
- Indigenous rights shouldn't be lost
- Need to be prepared to discuss weighting insofar as why it was or wasn't addressed
- Must acknowledge that the creation of Thresholds was a weighting in itself
- Description of intent will go a long way toward expressing problems associated with weighting
- Discussion of what "Industry clusters" are is needed
- A concern regarding the use of water volume and a need to choose drives the concern for weighting
- Weighting and addition of criteria are the biggest issues
- Use of evaluation criteria can be clarified. Renaming may take the charge out of "criteria" toward the weighting issue
- "Evaluate" may be the charged word – however we will be evaluating
- What needs to be included in the explanation?
- Use the glossary (preamble) as a means to solve the syntax issue

Thresholds – Suggestions and Comments

- Move "adaptive management" into "Local Control" – but an issue with this is it makes adaptive management a Threshold
- Get rid of "adaptive management" and instead use it as part of the description of the document (include it in the pre-amble (glossary))
- Clarify what is meant by "adaptive management"

Environment

- "Protect and maintain access for indigenous activities" and move to Access
- How does the District's work interface with "in-stream flows"?
- Move "energy..." to District Cost Recovery
- Concern regarding the potential to create energy at a financial loss. Is it agreeable to do so?
- Item #2 attempts to address the fact that the river went dry before the establishment of the District and is meant to address concerns for the estuary

(All other notes regarding specific criteria are in the Agreements)

Next Steps

What	Who	By When
Draft explanatory comments (make consistent with glossary)	Pete, Jana, Jacqueline and Carol	COB Dec. 4
Send out re-drafted evaluation criteria to AC	Jacqueline → Carol	COB Dec. 4
Conduct conference call for final check on evaluation criteria, preamble, Water Workshop, and learning objectives	All of AC	9:00 Monday, Dec. 7
Contact and brief the following members prior to Monday's 9 AM conference call	Dave V. WC Dennis Mayo Bruce WC Mark Jacqueline will WC Dennis Mullins and Pete	COB Dec. 4
Prepare for and review criteria to HBMWD Board. Jacqueline will convene conversation among these players to prepare for Thursday	Dave V., Michelle, Bill, and Jacqueline (Sheri will also be there to help as needed)	Dec. 10 at 10 AM

Few of the closing “words”

- Successful, productive, long and productive, worked our way through the conflicts really well, satisfied...

Present at meeting

Advisory Committee Members: Jacqueline Debets, Michelle Fuller, Jana Ganion, David Lindberg, Dennis Mayo, Pete Nichols, Bruce Rupp, Jim Smith, Kaitlin Sopoci-Belknap, Bill Thorington, Dave Varshock, Sheri Woo

Staff: Carol Rische, Mary Gelinias, Kerry Topel