

Notes from 11.05.09 HBMWD Water Resource Planning Advisory Committee

Desired Outcomes

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

- An understanding of their responses to the public meetings
- Agreement on next steps to gather feedback from Water Task Force and finalize the recommended evaluation criteria
- Agreement on who will present the evaluation to the HBMWD Board on Dec. 10 and how
- An understanding of the status of plans for the Water Workshop
- An understanding of what was learned at "Upstate" and potential implications for the Water Workshop
- Understanding of status of communication plan and agreement on how to handle input received via wrpinput@hbmwd.com
- Understanding of what else Advisory Committee wants/needs to learn and how best to accomplish that
- An agreement on the messages to communicate from this meeting
- How committee/meeting was effective and changes want to make

Agreements

- "Weighting" means assigning more importance or higher value to a criterion
- Define criteria better by clearing up the language since it contains a lot of semantic arguments
- Agreed for now that: (Both To be confirmed at next Advisory Committee meeting on Dec. 3)
 - One of the "threshold criteria" is that it is "legally viable."
 - "Local control" means that "HBMWD protects and maintains control of existing water rights"
- Try writing criteria using "threshold criteria" with the knowledge that they will be revisited Dec. 3
- Forward to the Board: 1) criteria with public sentiment; 2) original version viewed at the public meetings 3) criteria revised by AC given input at public meetings

Update on Action Items

- Glossary of terms a good idea. Pete agreed to initiate this work with Carol and ??? (did someone else express interest in this?)
- Jan. 20, 2010 from 9:30 – 11:30 will be joint meeting with the Board. This will be a public meeting
- Advisory Committee will hold the time. Details regarding the use of the lawyer's time while he is here in January will be worked out with the Board

Reflections on Public Meetings

- Went well. Appreciative of use and implementation of the public process
- Broad age range attended meetings
- Engaged participation

- There was repeated commentary regarding too much time on background and not enough on participation
- Education was appreciated and critical
- People appreciated public meeting where information was laid out like it was. Interested in the public's staying power. Will the public maintain its level of engagement?
- People didn't understand facts well prior to the meeting
- Interested to know how many participants were at more than one meeting
- Arcata's meeting was the best as McKinleyville was the beginning and Eureka had mic problems and was missing Carol
- Eureka had the most people and so people didn't get as much chance to be heard
- In Eureka, allowed questions to get ahead of presentation
- In general, it was a constructive process
- Need a tech person to help with the mics at the Wharfinger

Comments on Feedback on Public Meetings

- Get and use software to post explanatory information on-line for public participants to access
- Offer an optional (45 minute) early content workshop for those who haven't been to any public meetings thus far
- Suggest the Board share how the process is going with the WTF and municipalities
- Public communication – is it possible to allow the public to request information through the HBMWD web site?
- Allowing the public to request information would increase their level of engagement
- Return to original outreach groups?
- Create a marketing package to inform more people of the process
- Update with stakeholder groups – AC offers to present the process thus far in stakeholder meetings through January

Discussion on Evaluation Criteria (See also Agreements on page one)

- Need a mechanism for ranking/weighing
- All criteria must be applied equally in the creation of options
- May run into the issue of de-fault weighting if the number of criteria per category is used, e.g. 8 in "environmental," 4 in "local control"
- Structure and presentation of criteria may be a way to communicate ideas more clearly to the Board
- Threshold criteria are "legal" and "local control"
- None of the criteria are objective
- If rank the criteria, must explain ranking to maintain transparency and confidence in the process
- Possible method of evaluation – condense the categories so that all have the same number of criteria, then test them all against legal feasibility
- Shall the AC give the Board an emphasis of suggested weighting?
- AC needs to stay in front of the issue of weighting
- AC must rank the criteria since the public is expecting it

- Use the end result as a starting point for weighting
- Weighting doesn't "see" the impact of results
- Criteria should reflect the public's input
- Should give criteria to the Board – it is their duty to rank them
- "Threshold" = "must", "required", "baseline requirement"
- Bullets are explanatory regarding each criteria category – "for example"
- Things the AC wants 'done' to criteria 1) positive 2) specific 3) explanatory 4) "threshold" separated out 5) limit explanatory to 5 items 6) AC identify questions for decisions
- Which version for the WTF by Nov. 17? Present newer interim version worked on by Jacqueline, Sheri, and Bill

Water Workshop

- Before public discusses generating options, have them discuss and think strategically about the categories
- Humboldt's place in the big picture of the State is missing. Large statewide water issues that may impact Humboldt need to be included. The Water Workshop is a great opportunity to educate the public regarding those issues and needs to be included
- Perhaps present State issues during lunch?
- Economic development concern cannot be "skipped over" – the economic opportunities for using water need to be considered

"Upstate"

- We're on our own
- Business attraction/relocation is a focus

Next Steps

What	Who	By When
Initiate process to draft glossary of terms	Pete	Dec. 3 (?)
Clarify logistics for Jan. 10 Water Workshop including need for help with sound at Wharfinger		Dec. 3
Initiate creation of Google master calendar	Kaitlin	asap
Get next iteration of criteria out to Bill, Sheri, AC, and Mary	Jacqueline	Nov. 11
Get key messages regarding State "big picture" to include in Water Workshop to sub-committee	Mark	asap
If needed, schedule conference call with Kiera and David regarding the key messages regarding State "big picture" for the Water Workshop	Carol	as needed
Investigate on-line citizen participation options in place in Arcata and State (get contact info from Mark)	Mary	asap

Present at Meeting

Advisory Committee Members: Jacqueline Debets, Michelle Fuller, Dennis Mayo, Dennis Mullins, Pete Nichols, Bruce Rupp, Kaitlin Sopoci-Belknap, Bill Thorington, Mark Wheatley

Staff: Carol Rische, Mary Gelinias, Kerry Topel