

Notes from 09.03.09 HBMWD Water Resource Planning Advisory Committee

Desired Outcomes

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

- A shared understanding of the Advisory's Committee's reflections on/ responses to first Study Group session (the prior evening) ✓
- Agreement on next steps with data gathered at first Study Group meeting ✓
- Agreement on whether to sponsor a Water Symposium ✓
- Agreement on final agenda for first round of public meetings including who will do what at which meetings ✓
- An understanding of the status of the Communication Plan ✓
- Agreement on whether to have conference call with David Aladjem and agenda items for Sept. 15 ✓
- Messages to communicate from this meeting ✓
- How committee/ meeting was effective and changes want to make ✓

Agreements

- Bill, Sheri and David will draft evaluation criteria based on notes from Sept. 2 Study Group session
- At first round of public meetings, use small tables and rotate after description of criteria
- There will be a Water Symposium

Reflections on first Study Group session

- Not one naysayer—happy they were invited
- Surprised/ impressed with ability to build consensus
- Pleased with the process
- Amazed with the positivity
- Carol's presentation 'rocked the house'
- Surprised that rates and fear factor were not predominant
- 'Randoms' were proud
- 'Randoms' had lots of valuable input
- Rates arose but were couched in being 'reasonable'—within context of the situation
- Evaluations were overwhelmingly positive
- Send notes/ criteria to attendees
- Overall a positive experience
- Be cautious with expectations of and to Study Group members—be respectful of expectations / prior agreements.
- Time—perhaps one hour less
- Info condensed quickly which speaks to the process
- Preparation and focus assist our process

Next steps with input from first Study Group session

- Kerry will transcribe notes
- Exercise care regarding written documents due to 'legitimacy inherent in the written word' (include the process that led up to decisions)

Agreement on agenda for first round of public meetings in October

- Opening as written
- Current situation—same
- Evaluation criteria: Review how they were developed and explain what a criterion is
- Ask a few members of the Study Group to explain the process to the public
- Important to explain the process of selecting 'randoms' of Study Group participants

Public Meetings

October 13 Mckinleyville (Azalea Hall)	Jim and Dennis Mayo will review criteria Jana and Kaitlin will review next steps Will attend: Dave, Bill, Bruce, Sheri, Dennis Mullins
Oct. 14 Arcata (Community Center)	Dave and Sheri will review criteria Pete will review next steps Will attend: Dennis Mullins, Kaitlin, Bill?, Bruce, Jana
Oct. 22 Eureka (Wharfinger Building)	Jacqueline and Bill will speak re: criteria Dave will discuss next steps Will attend: Kaitlin, Bruce, Sheri

Water Symposium

- Sub-committee proposal
 - Educate all involved
 - A chance to see real expert information that will not be at public meetings
 - Very complementary to the public meetings
- Will provide solid foundation and framework of importance
- Tool to help come up with options that could work
- Creates realistic parameters
- Perhaps access people from the regulatory realm (in legal context) to address feasibility of options
- Address Chinook Salmon fishery issue

Water Symposium—Concerns/ objections/ reservations

- Presenters: Knowledgeable without an agenda or an ‘axe to grind’
- Time frame: mid-late January?
- Want to do it well given the tight time—frame
- Emphasize process to Water Symposium attendees – make it explicit
- Public access: Time of day and day of week to ensure equity of process
 - Provide alternate information access opportunities
 - Weekend may maximize attendees but may impact presenters
 - Time of day may be a better option i.e. later in the day is better, therefore mid-week, late afternoon/evening is better
- Include food at the symposium—may work as an attractor too
- ‘Workshop versus ‘symposium
- Ask sub—committee to survey Advisory Committee re: What they want to learn from the Water Symposium and possible speakers

Communication Plan

- Brought in Carol Harrison (journalist) to work on communication, press releases, etc.
- Web-site: Carol’s working on it—volunteers appreciated
- Put agenda for public meetings on web—site

Feedback on process thus far

- In general, working well
- Create master calendar on Google?
- Reduce number of meetings while maintaining quality
- Have Advisory Committee meetings once a month and sub-committee meetings in between
- Shorten or condense Study Group meetings
- Study Group was good
- Comfortable with ins and out of members
- Send power point presentations ahead OR post on web-site

Next Steps

What	Who	By When
Send criteria to Study Group attendees	Carol	9/12
Send summary of evaluations to Study Group attendees	Carol	9/12
Encourage Study Group members to attend public meetings and send them summaries of the notes from the public meetings	Carol	9/12?
Work with transcribed notes from 9/2 Study Group meeting to draft evaluation criteria	Bill, Sheri, Dave	Oct. 1
Work with staff to determine who will explain process of criteria development at first Study Group session	Kaitlin	Sept. 15
Get confirmed agenda to Dennis Mayo (and cities for web-sites)	Carol	Sept. 4 (!!)
Create instruction sheet for scribe or table hosts at public meetings	Mary	Oct. 1 (can't do until Oct. 12)
Survey Study Group. re: when to hold Water Symposium (weekend? weekday? time?)	Carol	9/9
Set date for Water Symposium	Sub-committee	9/9
Set up conference call with Attorney	Carol	9/15 3:00

Proposed desired outcomes for Oct. 1, 2009

- Agreement on WRP Advisory Committee roles over next month
- Everyone prepared for public meetings in October
- Understanding of input from 1st Study Group meeting
- Agreement on evaluation criteria to present to public
- Update from Water Symposium sub-committee