

Notes from 06.29.09 HBMWD Water Resource Planning Advisory Committee (Revised July 13, 2009)

Desired Outcomes

By the end of the meeting, the Water Resource Planning Advisory Committee will have:

- Continued to increase their ability to “think together” ✓
- Increased understanding of the District’s current situation ✓
- Agreement on “basic approach” to effectively and meaningfully engage stakeholders and interested members of the public **(to be completed July 21st)**
- Agreement on next steps including...
 - Advisory Committee meeting schedule ✓
 - How to handle it when members cannot attend meetings
 - Whether to audio or video taping meetings
 - Recommendation to Board regarding “Advisory Committee only” meetings ✓
 - Key outcomes or messages want to communicate from this meeting
 - How to develop a Communication Plan

“One Word”

In pairs, Committee members shared stories about something important or meaningful that had happened to them in the last week. When the members were in the listening role, they asked their partners “What made that important or meaningful to you?” until the other person was able to capture the meaning or importance of what happened in one word. These are the words the members shared. These qualities could usefully be integrated into the WRP process.

- Humility
- Selflessness
- Reverence
- Friendship
- Immediacy
- Magic
- Family (4)
- Resilience
- Empathy
- Learning
- Frustration
- Love

Thinking Talent Domains of Competence*

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Analytic</p> <p>Concerned with...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facts, data, numbers • Being logical, rational, analytical, critical • Quantitative • The need to know, to understand | <p>Innovative</p> <p>Concerned with...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The future, newness, trying something different • Possibilities • Synthesis and strategy • Big picture • Taking risks, breaking rules |
| <p>Procedural</p> <p>Concerned with...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organized, sequential process • Being planned, detailed, and reliable • Logistic and tactics • The need to know <i>how</i> something will occur • Desire to feel in control of what's happening | <p>Relational</p> <p>Concerned with</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feelings and morale • A sense of camaraderie, teamwork • Development of people • The need to know <i>who</i> will be involved |

* Drawn from the work of Dawna Markova, PhD. and Professional Thinking Partners.

Options for how to effectively and meaningfully engage stakeholders and interested members of the public

Note: definitions have been added to these notes by the facilitator

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>“Whoever shows up”</p> <p>Used in most current, traditional approaches to public processes. Events are publically announced; participants self-select; whoever shows up participates.</p> | |
| <p style="text-align: center;">Advantages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They are already motivated • Less time consuming for organizers | <p style="text-align: center;">Disadvantages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You don't get a good cross-section of the public • Introverted people may not be heard • Lack of follow-up for participants |
| <p>Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education / outreach with media (i.e. meetings, web, radio, TV) to get broader public and identify those willing / able to participate throughout • May not be good at Evaluate Options phase | |

Options for how to effectively and meaningfully engage stakeholders and interested members of the public (continued)

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Media (Blog, website, Access TV, talk radio)</p> <p>A technologically-based version of “Whoever shows up.”</p> | |
| <p>Advantages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access at any time (internet, TV) • Blog/ website may allow more participation from shy / introverted people in writing • Can have a more personalized back / forth of information | <p>Disadvantages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possible technology gap—not everyone has access • Anonymity / not face-to-face; can lead to lack of respect / persona; responsibility • Time consuming |
| <p>Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Really good for education and possibly throughout process | |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Temporary, randomly selected “Citizen’s Council” (any size, from HBMWD service area)</p> <p>Use exiting lists (voter lists, phone numbers, customer list) to create a random selection of citizens while maintaining gender and racial balance.</p> | |
| <p>Advantages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional citizen advocacy and understanding • Confirmation of “control” group • Democratic • Avoids perception of favoritism | <p>Disadvantages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parallel group/process to ours • Duplicative effort required to educate • Cost huge to manage • Potential to be a big problem, a PR nightmare if it goes wrong |
| <p>Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Back-up method to our group • Use to evaluate with ratepayers? | |

Options for how to effectively and meaningfully engage stakeholders and interested members of the public (continued)

Individual Stakeholder Meetings

Identify stakeholders (individuals or groups) and meet with them separately and/or ask them to nominate participants (usually using a specific set of criteria). The latter was used to solicit nominations for the WRP Advisory Committee. Could be used again to create a larger group of multi-stakeholders (see next option).

“Stakeholders” are those who (1) will be impacted by the outcomes of the process; (2) have decision making authority or influence over the topic at hand; or, (3) who could block the outcomes of the process. Stakeholders can also include “content experts.”

| Advantages | Disadvantages |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing interest in the issue • Existing good understanding • Smaller portion of the public • Skin in the game | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informing the already informed • Predisposed opinion of the issues • Smaller portion of the public |

Recommendation:

- Already used in the formation of C.A.C.
- Use in conjunction with open format meetings
- For presentation of recommendations

Options for how to effectively and meaningfully engage stakeholders and interested members of the public (continued)

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Multi-Stakeholder Meetings</p> <p>Identify and invite a diverse group that brings various perspectives to the conversation. These could include perspectives related to geography, age, gender, or political, economic, or social points of view.</p> | |
| <p>Advantages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build synergy / consensus • Build trust • Cover a lot of ground • Networking and outreach potential • Consistency of participation / participants | <p>Disadvantages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could get out of hand (counter-productive) • Not open / accountable / trust • Potential to harden positions / posturing |
| <p>Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diverse stakeholder groups required • This approach could work well in all phases, especially education, decision-making criteria | |

Options for how to effectively and meaningfully engage stakeholders and interested members of the public (continued)

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Survey, multiple methods (on-line, telephone)</p> <p>Gather input or feedback through emails, websites, or phone interviews.</p> | |
| <p>Advantages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inexpensive • Data gathering • Reach a lot of people | <p>Disadvantages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doesn't work for education phase • No control over who is responding • Hard to evaluate |
| <p>Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not for education process • OK for decision and evaluation options, but hard without education to evaluate • Could also re-define target • Could be used to gather people's level of education about or understanding of the issue • Could also be random sample, representative of customer-base • Could be linked to education, e.g., must read educational materials on line prior to taking survey | |

Options for how to effectively and meaningfully engage stakeholders and interested members of the public (continued)

| Targeted shareholder survey (customers of HBMWD, ratepayers) | |
|--|--|
| Advantages | Disadvantages |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More educated group • Works well if group is educated | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doesn't work in education phase • Perception of economic bias potential |
| Recommendation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-use for education phase • Use for generating options and evaluating options | |

Involvement Matrix (DRAFT)

| Options/Phase | Education | Decision criteria | Generate options | Evaluate options | Notes |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|--|------------------|---|
| Whoever shows up | Yes | | | No | |
| Citizen's council | | | | | Back-up method |
| Individual stakeholder meetings | Not deep education, already informed | Yes | Yes | Yes | |
| Multi-stakeholder meetings (diverse, broad-based) | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | In conjunction with individual stakeholder meetings |
| Survey, multiple methods | No | Yes (if people had the education, or education is built into survey) | Yes (if people had the education, or education is built into survey) | | |
| Media | Yes | For updates | For updates | For updates | |
| Targeted shareholder survey | No | | Yes | Yes | |

Possible Hybrid Process

- Website used for education, people will generate options—be willing to take them in at all stages
- Stakeholders involved in decision-making criteria. Need stakeholder buy-in in order for people to believe the decision-making criteria are valid
- Evaluate options—narrowing down. Use media, website, but we're making recommendation

Concerns / Questions

- Open this involvement process only to ratepayers or others too?
- Is there a mechanism to combine survey with education component? (e.g. in order to complete survey, they must read through website)
- Still need clarification on how to bring this information back to constituents

Types of Advisory Committee Activities and Meetings

- Educating
- Process Planning
- Gathering input
- Understanding / synthesizing input
- Deliberating and developing recommendations
- Gathering feedback
- Presenting recommendations

Recommendation to HBMWD Board regarding advisory committee meetings

- Generally speaking, not open to public in this formative stage
- Will be gathering public input through other means
- Anticipate many public meetings
- Expectation that all members would bring back information from meetings to constituent groups
- General public probably won't show up—not all that interesting!

Next Steps

| What | Who | By When |
|--|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Make decisions regarding “Involvement Matrix” | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• All | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 7/21 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reach closure on questions generated on 6/29/09 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• All | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 7/21 |
| Note meeting schedule: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Next meeting is Tuesday, July 21 from 1:30 to 4:30. Location TBA• After that, meetings are:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• First Thursday of the month, 9:30-12:30 (e.g., Aug. 6)• Third Tuesday of the month, 1:30-4:30 (e.g., Aug. 18)• | | |

Present at meeting

Advisory Committee Members: Jacqueline Debets, Verne Frost, Michelle Fuller, Jana Ganion, Rick Littlefield, Dennis Mayo, Dennis Mullins, Bruce Rupp, Jim Smith, Kaitlin Sopoci-Belknap, Bill Thorington, Dave Varshock, Mark Wheatley, Sherri Woo

Staff: Carol Rische, Mary Gelinas, Heather Equinoss